

1962

## Speeches Given Elsewhere

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

---

### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Speeches Given Elsewhere" (1962). *Mike Mansfield Speeches*. 1351.  
[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/1351](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1351)

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

May 21, 1962

MAIN FILE COPY  
DO NOT REMOVE

REMARKS OF MRS. MIKE MANSFIELD

**COPY**  
Gala Dinner of Democratic Women  
Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.  
Monday, May 21, 1962, 7:30 p.m.

~~The wife of a public figure is introduced by her husband.~~

Many of you, as wives, have glowed through the experience of being presented to an audience by your husbands. We stand. We smile. We sit down. Rarely are we called upon to say anything at all. If we are, it is usually not much more complex than "I am happy to be here." Tonight there is a unique opportunity to reverse the situation. The shoe is on the other foot and it is a high-heeled shoe.

In listening to the other introductions by the Kitchen Cabinet and in contemplating what I might say myself, it occurred to me that we are in a unique position to speak for all the wives who have been introduced by all the husbands over the years, decades and centuries.

How should we begin, then? Should we begin: "The men, God bless them!" Or should we say: "We can't do with them but we can't do without them." Or perhaps: "The real credit for all we women are and all we hope to be belongs to our unsung and unassuming husbands."

There is, as I said, a rare opportunity here. But after mulling over these possible beginnings, I believe I shall pass over it.

I shall pass over it because no matter how inept the words which are sometimes used by husbands to introduce wives, I think we wives in our hearts understand the spirit which moves the words.

- 2 -  
COPY

I understand it in the man whom I am about to present to you. I have understood it for a quarter of a century. I have understood it in the miner, the college-teacher, the Congressman, the Senator and the Majority Leader of the Senate. I have understood it most of all in the husband and the father and in the man whose life of service to his country, his family and to others I have been privileged to share through these many years of our times. Therefore, on second thought, I believe I shall return to my accustomed seat beside him and I shall not stir from it again until, at another time and in another place, I hear once again his customary warm and glowing references to me. But, before doing so, let me present to you a man in whom I have the greatest confidence and for whom I have the greatest love and affection. It is a great pleasure to introduce to you Mrs. Mansfield's husband, Mike.

Remarks of  
Senator Mike Mansfield  
(D. Montana)

REMARKS TO THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1962

Today marks the beginning of the Second Session of the 87th Congress. On January 20th, the 35th President will begin his second year in the White House. Those figures -- 35 Presidents, 87 Congresses -- give one a sense of the continuity and the stability of our form of government.

The past year has witnessed another aspect of American democracy: its vigor. It was a year of achievement, marked by the President's increasing popular support and evident command of his office; marked also by the effective and responsible cooperation of this body.

To Democrats in Congress, the President's strength in the country -- the confidence people have in his ability to lead us in the very tumultuous world we inhabit -- is an asset of incalculable value.



It means that the climate for progressive legislation is good. It

means that the country can face its problems with greater unity.

And it means that Democrats will enter the 1962 elections supported by a public servant whose leadership is firmly approved by the electorate.

I think this conference of Democratic Senators can take a few bows itself, when we talk about public support. The two recent Gallup Polls make good reading: one of them showed 79% of the people approving the way the President is handling his job; the other showed that 78% of the people believe the Democratic Party is best able to handle the problems they consider of paramount importance. I don't believe either one of these figures would have been nearly so high if the <sup>Senators</sup>~~men~~ in this room had performed less responsibly last year. In the check-and-balance system we serve under, the thoughtful cooperation of the Congress is essential for good government, and the public knows it. You provided it.

I do not think we should be troubled by the President's figure of 79% support, while the Party at large drew only 78%. The difference is Caroline, and there's nothing we can do about it.

Let me take a few moments to go over some of the achievements of the last session in the domestic field. They include several laws of considerable importance to the country's present and future, and it is worth recalling what those are:

The area redevelopment program was established for economically distressed areas.

The minimum wage was increased to \$1.25 per hour, and more than 3 1/2 million workers were brought under wage and hour protection for the first time.

The social security program was liberalized, benefits to widows increased, and men permitted reduced benefits on retirement at 62.

A far-reaching housing act was adopted, providing, for the first time, long-term, low-interest housing for middle-income families.

Assistance was provided for the dependent children of needy unemployed parents.

A highly successful feed grains program was enacted.

The highway and airport acts were extended and improved.

A realistic water pollution control program--that is, one that can begin to meet community needs--was adopted.

The Senate passed a manpower retraining program which will help those men threatened with the loss of their jobs to machines to develop new skills.

A mass transportation program was put under way.

In the field of natural resources, the Senate passed major legislation affecting wilderness and shoreline areas; created a great

oceanographic research program; and stepped up the Government's work in saline water conversion.

Five major agency reorganization plans went into effect.

Federal criminal law was strengthened, particularly in the anti-gambling area.

The Senate adopted a large-scale aid to education program, the debate on which will serve to instruct many Congresses to come.

That is a partial account of the work you did in the domestic area.

In defense and foreign policy matters, the record was equally outstanding. Congress approved of the principle of long-term commitments to the mutual security program; appropriated \$600 million for aid to Latin America; created the Disarmament Agency and the Peace Corps; approved the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and, because it accepted the philosophy of Winston Churchill



and John F. Kennedy -- that -- we should "arm to parley" -- Congress gave the President what he asked for in military weapons and personnel.

Speaking of defense, I want to say a word about our military preparedness as we enter 1962. I expect most of you have been impressed, as I have, with the competence and drive of the defense establishment during the past year. It has clearly become, in the words of the Secretary of Defense, a more effective instrument of our foreign policy. In his report to the people last week, Secretary McNamara listed a number of accomplishments during 1961.

There has been a 50% increase in the portion of our strategic bombing force on 15-minute alert.

The size of the Polaris submarine force to be available by the end of 1964 has been increased by 50%.

There has been a 100% increase in our capacity to produce Minuteman missiles.

There have been substantial increases in the number of

ready combat units and anti-guerrilla forces, and in our airlift and sea-lift capacity to move these forces where they are needed.

Gains have been made in organization: in creating a Defense Intelligence Agency, a Defense Supply Agency, in planning and budgetary controls, and in the creation of a Strike Command combining the strategic Army and the tactical Air Force.

The events of 1961 proved again how important our defense preparedness is to the security of the world. We suffered setbacks and frustrations in the world last year; Berlin and Southeast Asia gave us many anxious days, and will continue to do so; and yet I believe the efforts made to strengthen our military forces during the year--including the sacrifices made by the reserve and National Guard units called up in the Autumn--resulted in a world picture on New Year's Day somewhat brighter than we expected it to be last Summer.

In these times it is a commonplace to say that much work lies ahead to make free institutions safer and free people more

prosperous. Nevertheless it is true; we turn from a heavy calendar of work in 1961 to an equally heavy one in the session ahead. We have profoundly important decisions to make in the field of international trade. We face great questions of tax policy, medical assistance to the aged, higher education -- to suggest only a few of those matters on the horizon at this moment. We must expect other questions of urgency during the session, as critical as those we know about now.

In the resolution of these matters, I remind you again that I am your servant -- as nearly as I can be, your advocate in discussions at the White House, and your representative in scheduling the business of the Senate. I learned a good deal about the Senate last year, and I expect to learn a good deal more this year -- and indeed I should, because I am instructed in the subject by an incomparable faculty. I may add that, so far as I have anything to say about it, classes will usually end in time for dinner.

Before I close I want to say a word about our relations with the President. If my opinion of him is not already clear, I will spell it out: He has the capacity to be one of our greatest chief executives. I believe he will offer us this year, as he did in 1961, a sound program for America. I expect to be one of the most consistent supporters of that program in the Congress. I hope he will find the great majority of his Party behind him when it counts. But I say again, as I did in our initial meeting last year, that the President is no admirer of monolithic thinking. He was too long a Member of Congress to believe that all wisdom resides in the Executive Branch. The best service we can render the President, and the country at large, is to speak our minds after mature reflection, and to make such laws as our conscience and reason demand.

No one in this room, and certainly no one in the White House, conceives that the world's gravest problems will be settled by the fiat



of the President, or the bills and resolutions of the Congress.

There are those who believe the President should propose a recipe

for instant Utopia, and that Congress should then be challenged to

cook it. In my opinion that recipe has not been found, and the President

will be suspicious of anything put up as qualifying for it. He knows

that advances in human affairs are made painstakingly, by the cooperation

and hard work of men of good will. I believe he will receive both from

the Senate this year.

I cannot conclude these remarks without expressing my personal thanks to the Chairman of all the committees for their understanding ~~and~~ advice over the past year; to those, who in addition to the Chairman if floor managed & guided important legislation through the Senate; & finally, to each individual Senator for ~~their~~ <sup>their</sup> courtesy, tolerance, & counsel. You have all made my position easier & what ~~could~~ <sup>progress</sup> we have ~~made~~ <sup>achieved</sup> has been collectively achieved by you.

5-5-62 draft

I have not come here to persuade you to do what you have already made up your minds to do. This gathering in May can only mean one thing in November. You are going to vote your confidence in President Kennedy and the Democratic Congress. You are going to do it by electing your dedicated Representative, Dan Flood, your outstanding Senator, Joe Clark and other members of our party.

As democrats, it is easy to vote for democrats. But I like to believe and I do believe that Democrats are moved by something more than passion for their party. I like to believe and I do believe that the Kennedy Administration, a Democratic Congress and the Democratic Party have something more to offer the people of the United States than a party label. I believe this nation has a democratic government in office because democrats offer a greater alertness to the problems

of a changing nation in a changing world. We offer a vision of a finer future for all our citizens and we offer the energy and leadership to bring that vision to reality. We offer an administration that has begun to move this nation ahead again and has the determination to keep it moving.

Some of us are democrats because we like the sound of the name. Some of us are democrats because our fathers were democrats. But we are all democrats because we have the sense to see the world and the nation as it is. We are all democrats because we have the vision of a nation growing in the strength, in the unity, in the equality and in the vigour of all its people in the years and decades to come. We are all democrats because we are not prepared to stand pat. We are all Democrats because we would not turn back the clock even if we could.



Even in a partisan meeting of this kind, I think we have to recognize it is not only Democrats who can be described in these terms. There are others. But I do say that there is a significant difference between a Republican Administration and a Democratic Administration in Washington. I do say that there is a difference in a Republican-controlled and a Democratic-controlled Congress. I do say that any honest examination of the record of the 8 years of the previous Administration and the one year of this Administration will reveal that difference. I do say that the principal difference lies in seeing today as it is and tomorrow as it is likely to be, of looking ahead rather than behind, of discerning what we have gained instead of bewailing what we have not really lost. I do say that on



a whole range of domestic questions we have moved forward prudently and rapidly in one year and a few months of the Kennedy Administration.

I do say that there has been a redoubled effort to strengthen both our

security and the prospects for peace in the world. I do say ~~there has~~ <sup>we</sup>

*have made* *on meeting the accumulated social and economic needs*  
~~been a beginning on meeting the current needs~~ of the people of the

United States. As citizens, even more than as Democrats, we have a responsibility to invite all Americans, of whatever inclination, to vote their confidence in this advance by their choices in the November election.

You are entitled to know, the people of this state and the nation are entitled to know, some of the principal facts about this advance. Let's start with unemployment. I don't have to tell you

anymore than I have to tell the people of my own state about this problem. The mines everywhere have been particularly hard hit by it. This area, if I am not mistaken is in the 10% plus bracket *in unemployment* Nation-wide we have several millions out of work. That has been the situation, a little better, a little worse, for many years.

Now, Republicans, no less than Democrats, know that it is not good for a man to be out of work and without resources. It is not good for the man, his family or the nation. Where, then, is the difference? The difference is that this Administration believes there is a public responsibility to do something about this difficulty

and accepts that responsibility. The difference is that this Administration recognizes that no man will ever be really secure in his own work unless all men and women who are able and willing to work can find work. The difference is that this Administration does not hide its concern behind glowing statistics of progress which have no meaning for the man without a job or the man whose job doesn't pay enough for a minimum livelihood, or the man about to lose his job in the very process of progress. This Administration does not take refuge in the hope that vague, so-called natural economic forces will act to overcome these difficulties. It asks what becomes of the man in the meantime? A question like that can only be answered by action and this Administration

and a Democratic Congress have acted. We have acted to extend unemployment compensation insurance. We have provided aid to the dependents of the unemployed. We have increased minimum wages.

Yet, this Administration recognizes that these measures are largely in the nature of a stop-gap. These measures relieve the immediate adverse effects of unemployment but they do not get at the heart of the problem. And it is at the heart of the problem of unemployment that we are aiming. Democrats aspire to an America in which all Americans of all ages who want to work will never ~~again~~ know the fear or the actuality of being out of work through no fault of their own. We have a long way to go. This challenge is not going to be met overnight, in a month, in a year. But I can assure you of one thing: I know that the President, a democratic Congress and the



democratic party are not going to rest content until it is met.

We have made a beginning about which you in this community have some first-hand knowledge. Your Congressman was a key figure in the Area Redevelopment Act. He drove for the Flood-Douglas bill in the House, just as Joe Clark fought for it in the Senate. The President, I believe, singled out this area of Pennsylvania as the number one depressed region of the nation and if I am not mistaken Luzerne County received the first federal grant under the program.

Now, ~~you and~~ I know that that is the kind of honor every  
section of this country wishes that it did not have <sup>To have.</sup> But the way  
to end a difficulty is to face it and to act on it. You have seen  
the beginning of action on depressed areas, thanks to a democratic  
President and a democratic Congress and you will see more <sup>action.</sup> ~~of it.~~  
You will see it in the Manpower Training Act which the Congress has

recently passed. If we are not going to leave areas in permanent depression, we ~~are~~<sup>are</sup> most certainly not going to leave men and women to stagnate in the backwash of rapidly changing patterns of industry, and in the increasing bypass of the unskilled or surplus skilled by the spread of automation. This administration has begun to probe in depth, for the first time, the full implications of that word automation. The President has labeled it the foremost challenge of our times and set the best brains he can find to work on it.

Automation is a challenge which is as full of promise in the long run as it is ominous in the short run. As Democrats, we are determined that the benefits of this great advance--and it is a great advance--will be spread throughout the population and not just to a few. We are determined that the sacrifices, the human price of this advance, and, there is a heavy human price--will be borne by all and not just the man or woman who labors for a livelihood.

There are other fields in which this Administration is trying and will continue to try to move the nation forward. In housing, we have acted and we will continue to act to the end that decent shelter will be within the reach of all. In the extension and improvement of the highways and airways we have acted and will continue to act to meet today's urgencies and to anticipate the needs of tomorrow. In developing the great natural resources of this country, in improving the supplies of water through pollution control, in setting aside large areas of our natural heritage of forest, river and coast for the recreation of the people, we have acted to meet the needs of today and tomorrow and we will continue to act. In encouraging small business and helping to improve its competitive position we have



acted and will continue to act because we believe small business is the leaven which keeps the economy of the nation flexible, creative and growing.

Insofar as big business and big labor are concerned, the actions of both have a profound effect on the stability and orderly growth of the nation's economy. This Administration has no quarrel with either. Nor will there be any quarrel, so long as both--not one or the other but both--fulfill their responsibilities, not only to their stockholders or their members but to the nation.

The President is determined that these responsibilities shall be met. I think we all now have a pretty clear idea that ~~they are going~~ <sup>he is going to do</sup> ~~to be met.~~

Whatever ~~is~~ he can ~~see~~ to see that they are met.



Still ahead of us is the challenge to improve the educational structure of this nation from top to bottom. We will not rest content until every boy and girl has an opportunity to be schooled, in excellence, to the limits of their capacity and ambition, regardless of where they may happen to be born and regardless of <sup>family</sup> ~~the~~ financial condition ~~of~~ ~~the families~~. This improvement is essential to the security and continued progress of the nation. It is basic to the achievement of all the ideals which are our common heritage.

Ahead of us, too, is the battle for decent hospitalization and related care for the older citizens of this nation. It is not that the other party does not recognize that people get old and get sick and frequently need expensive care which millions cannot afford.

I do not know of anyone in public life who does not recognize at least some of these common facts. The difference is that this Administration and <sup>the Democratic</sup> ~~the~~ party are determined to do what must be done to see to it that all older citizens get that care as a matter of right and not as a matter of charity, that they get it by public insurance, by social security and not by chance or charity. We are determined that they get it not as a reluctant handout but with the dignity befitting Americans. And we are running into a familiar resistance in trying to get it. We are in the same old battle of the 1930's, with the same arguments which were advanced by some who professed their sympathy for the <sup>them</sup> ~~the~~ old people but then voted against the social security retirement insurance program. Yet, who would change social security now? Who would stop the flow of those hard-earned monthly retirement

cheques? Who would suggest that we shift this <sup>successful</sup> system <sup>of retirement insurance</sup> to hundreds  
of private insurance companies? Who would want to force millions of  
older citizens to go back to the good old days before Social Security?  
I can tell you that this Administration has ~~not~~ intention of going  
back to those days. This Administration is determined to move further  
away from them. It is determined to extend social security <sup>retirement insurance</sup> to cover  
hospitalization and <sup>related</sup> ~~other~~ <sup>all</sup> ~~care~~ <sup>older</sup> to ~~all~~ <sup>retired</sup> Americans. And, may I  
say that we would welcome an assist from Republicans in Congress. What  
we have gotten so far is a confusion of the question by the addition  
of catch words like socialized medicine and private <sup>insurance</sup> ~~policies~~. But you  
know and I know that the present social security system works and has  
worked ~~well~~ for almost a quarter of a century. ~~And~~ <sup>A</sup> system of  
hospitalization for older people, built, essentially, around the same



social security approach can work just as well. That is what the President wants and that is what the Democratic Leadership is going to try to get. When this issue reaches a climax--as it will in the near future--bear in mind that just about everybody is likely to be for hospital aid for the older folks. But the real issue is going to be the social security approach that is tried and proven as against money-making schemes of hospitalization, <sup>labeled private but</sup> paid for by the government, <sup>-schemes</sup> which means by you ~~say~~ which might or might not prove effective.

These are some of the facts that the voters of this state and the nation are entitled to have. These are the domestic issues--the common sense issues--which we have got to face as a nation. Republicans in general stand on one side of them. Democrats in general stand on the other. And I do not have to tell you which is which.



Clearly, each issue does not affect every citizen in the same way. A man out of work worries more about unemployment than a bank president. Families whose income permits them to pay for a first-class education for their children on up through medical school or law school or whatever may not be so directly concerned with the condition of the educational establishment of the nation. Pennsylvanians may be too busy thinking about their own situation to worry about unemployment in Montana. New Yorkers have so many urban problems that they can't be expected to be concerned about the desperate need for irrigation in California.

*business school, engineering degree,*

*rural parts of*

But let us never forget--Pennsylvanians, Montanans, New Yorkers or Californians--that we are one nation. And what strengthens any part of this nation in the long run strengthens the whole. What hurts any


part of the nation, if it is ignored by the rest, sooner or later hurts us all. We will either stand together in common sacrifice for the advance of all Americans, for the common benefit, or we will, sooner or later, pay separately the price of selfishness, drift, neglect and sectionalism.

In no other place will this price be higher than in its impact on this nation's place in the world. The arena of international relations is the entire globe. Even now, it is an arena which is expanding to encompass the moon and the planets. In this vast arena, the struggle for peace and for national security is a far more complex affair than all of the domestic challenges put together. This is no place for quick and quack solutions. This is the place for sobriety, for caution, and for a ~~sober~~ respect for the immensity of the difficulties.

This is the place for a steadfast courage and a calm wisdom. This is the place for sober recognition of the tremendous necessity of all peoples for a more stable peace. This is the place for the glint of a deep knowledge and a deep compassion as well as for the glint of steel.

This Administration is not building from scratch in foreign policy. It is building on what has gone before because foreign policy does not stop when one administration ends and another begins. An administration inherits , in foreign policy, all the mistakes as well as all the achievements of the administrations which have preceded it. In this matter, former President Eisenhower and other Republicans deserve full credit for their contribution because when it comes to foreign policy, we are not and ought not to be either Democrats first or Republicans first but Americans first and foremost.



It is not easy to shift gears in foreign policy. It will take time before the effects of ~~the~~ changes in foreign relations are felt under this Administration. It will not be easy to bring changes about. It will not be cheap. Foreign aid will have to go on. Tens of billions of dollars will continue to be spent each year for the armed forces. Billions more will go into space exploration.  The President does not enjoy spending this money, as we have been doing for years, anymore than you like to have it come out of your earnings. But that is the price of cold war, of the world's fears and anxieties. It is the price of the survival of freedom and the integrity of this nation in a time of world-wide upheaval, uncertainty, aggression and hostility. I can assure you that if any man can lead in the modification of this situation, if any man has the wit and wisdom to lead in the creation of



a more stable world situation, a more durable peace, it is the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. He will need the understanding, patience and support of all the American people and if I know the people of this nation, he is going to get it.

Even now, he is acting to rebuild our neglected relations in Latin America, to hold the line in Asia, to try to come to some sort of sensible agreement to end atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons without danger to national security, and to defuse the perilous situation in Berlin. And last but not least, he is attempting to bring a great enlargement in our international trade--in order that the resources of farm, mine and factory which we have in such abundance can be sold abroad in return for what we can use from abroad. Some people ~~that are going to~~ <sup>will</sup> be hurt for awhile in this process but this

Administration is not going to let them bear the brunt of change which is of benefit to the entire nation. This Administration wants to proceed carefully and with understanding and with special consideration for those who might be temporarily hurt. But we have all got to face the fact that we can't sell abroad if we are not ready to buy from abroad. We have all got to face the fact that international trade is now an integral part of our hope for economic stability and advance in the years to come. We will realize this hope only as we are able to expand both our buying and selling with other nations.

I have tried to give you a picture of what your democratic party has done and is trying to do in Washington. Take that picture to the voters in November. Take it to them in all honesty for we need

have no fear of the people if they understand it in all honesty.

Take it to them and they will <sup>just</sup> ~~send us~~ <sup>in office, democrats in office</sup> men who will work <sup>democrats</sup> with a

mind of their own, with something to contribute themselves and at

the same time in close cooperation with the President for the benefit

of the entire nation and all its citizens.

REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D., MONTANA)

COPY  
at the

MAIN FILE COPY  
DO NOT REMOVE

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner

The Shirley-Savoy Hotel, Denver, Colorado

Saturday, March 24, 1962

Mr. Chairman:

I understand that your state has been the scene of repeated invasions in recent months. If my information is correct, you have been attacked by various spokesmen of the Republican party. They have come from the north, south, east and the 19th Century. From the looks of this meeting, tonight, it seems to me that the democratic ramparts of Colorado still stand.

I certainly would not want my visit to be construed as getting into this political fight. As a matter of fact, politics was the last thing I had in mind in coming here tonight. I just happened to be passing through on this Jefferson-Jackson Day. I just happened to be passing through when the dinner bell rang for the re-election of John Carroll. I just happened to be passing through Colorado en route from Washington, D. C. to Boston, Massachusetts. The railroads are getting rid of so much passenger service these days, it was the only way I could make it. Now that I am here, quite by accident, I want to thank you for your welcome and your hospitality.



# COPY

In all seriousness, may I say that I think it is inevitable that election campaigns are becoming more national in scope. That is because the issues are also becoming more national in scope. More and more, what affects Colorado has a similar meaning for Montana and the West and for the entire nation. Senators are Senators from their own states and Senators of the United States. Presidential Administrations are not only for the urban areas or the rural areas but for all areas. They are not only for big business or small business but for all business. They are not only for doctors but for patients as well. They are not only for <sup>management</sup> ~~managers~~ but for labor as well.

I don't think anyone planned it that way. It is part of the growth and the changing nature of our society and the world.

As a democrat, I have no fear for the future of our party in this transition. We have in the Kennedy Administration, an administration for the people of Colorado and for the people of all the 50 states. You have in John Carroll, not only a Senator from Colorado but, in the finest sense of the phrase, a Senator of all the United States.

It is obvious that this group, tonight, does not have to be persuaded to give a vote of confidence to President Kennedy and his Administration. And I don't think you need any convincing that John Carroll is one of the great Senators to come out of Colorado.

COPY

*Believing* → But I like to believe and I do believe that Democrats are consumed not merely with a passion for their party. I like to believe and I do believe that <sup>the Kennedy</sup> ~~this~~ Administration and the Democratic Party have something more to offer the people of the <sup>United</sup> ~~the~~ States than a party label. I believe we offer to the people a more realistic comprehension of the world at this point in time and a more realistic comprehension of where this nation stands in it. I believe we offer to the people of the United States a greater alertness to the problems of a changing nation in a changing world. I believe we offer to them a vision of a finer future for all our citizens and we offer the energy and leadership to bring that vision to fruition. We believe that men can master man-made forces and channel them to the benefit of all our people. We believe in looking at today and towards tomorrow, not backward to another time and world that is no more. We believe we have an administration that has begun to move this nation ahead again and we are determined to keep moving.

In two sentences, this democratic administration believes that security and peace can be achieved for this nation. And we believe that while we are pursuing these goals abroad we can also act to diffuse the benefits and the sacrifices of human progress among all the people of the United States.



- 4 -  
**COPY**

*Some of us* We are democrats, ~~not~~ because we like the sound of the name.  
*Some of us* We are democrats ~~not~~ because our fathers were democrats, although we  
*But all* loved our fathers. <sup>all</sup> We are democrats because we have the <sup>sense</sup> realism to see  
the world and the nation as it is. We are democrats because we have the  
vision to <sup>of a</sup> see <sup>all</sup> our nation growing in the strength, in the unity, in the  
equality and in the vigour of all ~~its~~ people in the years and decades  
to come. We are <sup>all</sup> democrats because we are not prepared to stand pat.  
*all Democrats because we know that* We are ~~not~~ prepared to turn back the clock. *cannot be turned back.*

Even in a partisan meeting of this kind, I would not claim  
that only Democrats hold these beliefs. It takes all kinds to make a  
party, a nation and a world and I mean that in all sincerity. But I  
do say that there is a significant difference between a Republican Ad-  
ministration and a Democratic Administration. I do say that there is  
a difference in a Republican-controlled and a Democratic-controlled  
Congress. I do say that any <sup>honest</sup> dispassionate examination of the record of  
the 8 years of the previous Administration and the one year of this Ad-  
ministration will reveal that difference. I do say that the principal  
difference lies in ~~the area of~~ seeing today as it is and tomorrow as it  
will be, of looking ahead rather than behind, <sup>of</sup> discerning what we have  
gained instead of bewailing what we have not really lost. I do say that  
on a whole range of domestic questions we have moved forward prudently

- 5 -  
**COPY**

and rapidly in scarcely one year of the Kennedy Administration. I do say that there has been a redoubled effort to strengthen both our security and the prospects for peace in the world. I do say that your Senator, John Carroll, has been in the forefront of this advance. I do say that <sup>A citizens</sup> as Americans, even more than as Democrats, we have a responsibility to keep this advance moving by inviting all <sup>Americans</sup> Americans of whatever inclination to vote their confidence in this advance by their choices in the November election.

You are entitled to know, the people of this state and the nation are entitled to know, some of the principal facts about this advance. Let's start with unemployment. <sup>I don't have to tell you</sup> We have had a persistent <sup>How I have to tell the people of my own state about this</sup> problem of several million unemployed for a number of years. Now, <sup>problem</sup> Republicans, no less than Democrats, know that it is not good for a <sup>the numbers have been particularly high but by it is whether it is</sup> man to be out of work and without resources. It is not good for the man, his family or the nation. Where, then, is the difference? The difference is that this Administration believes there is a public responsibility to do something about this difficulty. <sup>A</sup> The difference is <sup>as</sup> that this Administration recognizes that no man will ever be really secure <sup>advised</sup> in his own work unless all men who are able and willing to work can find work. The difference is that this Administration does not hide its concern behind glowing statistics of progress which have no meaning for the man without a job or the man whose job doesn't pay enough for a minimum <sup>as in the 10% bracket. Nationwide we have several millions out of work. That is a situation that has been the little bit worse, a little better, for some years.</sup>



- 6 -  
**COPY**

is not satisfied  
just because there  
are no headlines  
or notes. Mrs.  
Roosevelt

livelihood or the man about to lose his job in the very process of progress. This Administration does not take refuge in the hope that vague so-called natural economic forces will act to overcome these difficulties. It asks what becomes of the man in the meantime? A question like that can only be answered by action and this Administration and a Democratic Congress have acted. We have acted to extend unemployment compensation insurance. We have provided aid to the dependents of the unemployed. We have increased minimum wages.

Yet, this Administration recognizes that these measures are largely in the nature of a stop-gap. These measures relieve the adverse effects of unemployment but they do not get at the heart of the problem. And it is at the heart of the problem of unemployment that we are aiming. We aspire to an America in which all Americans of all ages who want to work will never again know the fear of being out of work through no fault of their own.

*We have a long way to go. This challenge is not going to be met overnight, but I don't assume you*

And to that end, we have also begun to move. We have had action and there will be more action in depressed regions of this nation.

*We are not going to leave any area which have been left to stagnate with the changing patterns of economic*  
(over)

organization in this country. We are now moving with the Manpower Training Act to the aid of the men and women who have been left to stagnate.

*by administered in the area. If we are not going to leave*  
with the patterns of rapid change in the industrial processes, with the increasing bypass of the unskilled or surplus skilled by the spread of

*areas to stagnate  
we are certainly not going to leave men and women to stagnate*

*If one thing I know that the President and a democratic Congress and the democratic party is not going to rest until it is met. We have made a beginning and we have begun to move.*

COPY

I think you know what just  
happened about that. You know what  
the Douglas Flood your Congressman  
was a key figure in the area  
redemption act. He drove for the  
Flood - Douglas bill in the House,  
just as Joe Clark fought for  
it in the Senate. He succeeded,  
I believe singled out this area as the number  
one depressed region of the nation and  
if I am not mistaken Teton County  
received the first federal grant under  
the program. Now, you and I know  
that that is the kind of honor  
every section of this country wishes  
that it did not have to share.  
But the way to end a difficulty  
is to face it and to act on  
it. You've seen the beginning of  
action. Thanks to the President and  
your able representation in Congress and you  
must see more of it. You will see it



COPY

automation. And, Finally, this administration has begun to probe in

depth, for the first time, the full implication of that word automation. *The President has labeled it the foremost challenge of our times and which is as full of promise in the long run as it is ominous in the short run. We are determined that the benefits of this great advance--and it is a great advance--will be spread throughout the population and not to just a few. We are determined that the sacrifices, the human price of this advance, and, there is a heavy human price--will be borne by all and not just the man who labors for his livelihood.* *As Democrats,* *The bent brains he can find to work on it. Automation is a challenge.*

There are other fields in which this Administration is trying and will continue to try to move the nation forward. In housing, we have acted and we will continue to act to the end that decent shelter will be within the reach of all. In the extension and improvement of the highways and airways we have acted and will continue to act to meet today's urgencies and to anticipate the needs of tomorrow. *In encouraging small business and helping to improve its competitive position we have acted and will continue to act because we believe small business is the leaven which keeps the economy of the nation flexible, creative and growing. In developing the great natural resources of this country, in improving the supplies of water through pollution control, in assisting the hard-hit mining industries, in setting aside large areas of our natural heritage of forest, river and coast for the recreation of the people we have acted to meet the needs of today and tomorrow and we will continue to act.*

*Insofar as big business and labor are concerned, this administration expects both to fulfill their responsibilities -- not one or the other but both -- to fulfill their responsibilities, not only to their stockholders or their members but to the nation. Both the individual (s)*

- 8 -  
**COPY**

Still ahead of us is the challenge to improve the educational structure of this nation from top to bottom. We will not rest content until every boy and girl has an opportunity to be schooled, in excellence, to the limits of their natural capacity and ambition, regardless of where they may happen to be born and regardless of their financial condition of the families. ~~And may I say a Republican assist in the House of Representatives in trying to turn this American ideal into reality would be most welcome.~~

Ahead of us, too, is the battle for decent hospitalization and related care for the older citizens of this nation. It is not that the other party does not recognize that people get old and get sick and frequently need expensive care which millions cannot afford. I do not know of anyone in public life who does not recognize the facts. The difference is that this Administration and this party is determined to do what must be done to see to it that all older citizens get that care as a matter of right and not as a matter of charity, that they get it by insurance, by social security and not by chance. We are determined that they get it with the dignity befitting Americans and not as a reluctant handout. And we are running into a familiar resistance in trying to get it. We are in the same old battle of the 1930's, with the same arguments advanced by those who sympathized with the old people but then voted against the social security retirement insurance program. Yet, who would change

*to keep the poor honest*  
*MS*



COPY

social security now? Who would stop the flow of those hard-earned monthly retirement cheques? Who would want to force millions of older citizens to go back to the good old days before Social Security? I can tell you that this Administration has no intention of going back to those days. This Administration is determined to move further away from them. It is determined to extend social security to cover hospitalization and other care to all retired Americans. And, ~~again~~, may I say that we would welcome an assist from Republicans in Congress. *What we have*

These are some of the facts that the voters of this state and the nation are entitled to have. These are the domestic issues--the common sense issues--which we have got to face as a nation. Republicans in general stand on one side of them. Democrats in general stand on the other. *I do not have to tell you* And you know which is which.

Clearly, each issue does not affect every citizen in the same way. Obviously a man out of work worries more about unemployment than a bank president. Families whose income may permit them to pay for a first-class education for their children on up through medical school or law school or whatever may not be so directly concerned with the condition

of the educational establishment of the nation. *Pennsylvania* ~~Coloradans may not think~~ *be too busy thinking about their own situation to worry* too much about employment in West Virginia or New Yorkers about the development of irrigation in Colorado. *Montana* *the desperate need for* *California*

*have so many urban problems that they can't be expected to be too concerned about*

*gotten so far is a confusion of the question by the addition of catch words like socialized medicine and private insurance. But you have not proved that the social security system (over)*

let us <sup>new</sup> forget - Pennsylvanians, Montanans,  
New Yorkers or  
Californians that  
- 10 -  
COPY

But we are one nation. And what strengthens any part of this nation in the long run strengthens the whole. What hurts any part of the nation eventually hurts us all, if it is ignored by the rest. We will either stand together for the advance of ~~all~~ <sup>America</sup> ~~for~~ <sup>of all Americans</sup> the common benefit and in common sacrifice or we will, sooner or later, pay separately the price of selfishness, drift, and neglect <sup>and sectionalism</sup>.

In no other place will the <sup>price</sup> ~~price of selfishness, drift and~~ neglect be higher than in its impact on this nation's place in the world. I wish I could report to you that we have made advances in foreign relations in this first year of the Administration which are as tangible as those on the domestic front. I cannot, in all honesty, do so. The arena of <sup>international</sup> these relations is the entire globe. Even now, it is an arena which is expanding to encompass the moon and the planets. In this vast arena, the struggle for peace and for national security is a far more complex affair than all of the domestic challenges put together. What is involved is not only the 130,000,000 people of the United States but the 2,271,300,000 people of the planet. What is involved is not a unified, stable nation able to act with a sense of purpose but a world in disunity and ever on the edge of the chaos of war, a war, moreover, which could spell the doom of civilized existence as the human race has evolved it over the centuries and millenia. May I say that this great arena of world affairs is no place for an advance on a White Charger or an ostrich retreat into the



COPY

social security now who would stop the flow of these funds—  
essentially retirement checks? Who would want to force millions of other  
citizens to go back to the good old days before Social Security? I can  
tell you that this Administration has no intention of going back to those  
days. This Administration is determined to move further away from them.  
It is determined to expand social security to cover hospitalization and  
other care to all retired Americans. And, again, say I say that we would  
without an instant from Republicans in Congress. *What are you*

These are some of the facts that the voters of this state and  
the voters of the nation are the domestic issues—the  
country will have to face as a nation. Republicans  
in general stand on one of them. Democrats in general stand on the  
other. And yet, when it comes to the issue of social security, they are  
all in the same boat. They are all in the same boat.

*schemes which might not prove effective*

Clearly, each issue does not affect every citizen in the same  
way. Obviously a man out of work worries more about unemployment than a  
bank president. Families whose income may permit them to pay for a first-  
class education for their children on up through medical school or law  
school or whatever may not be so directly concerned with the condition  
of the educational establishment of the nation. Republicans say not-thing  
about it. Democrats say not-thing about it. But when it comes to the issue of social security, they are all in the same boat.

*for old age works and it works well. And a system of hospitalization, built essentially around the social security approach can work just as well. It is hard enough so when this issue reaches a climax—as it will in the near future—bear in mind that it is the social security approach that is true and proven as against schemes*

- 11 -  
**COPY**

~~bomb shelters. This is no place for the fast gun or the delusions of grandeur. This is no place for the loud words and the braggarts. This is no place for quick and quack solutions. This is the place for sobriety, for caution, and for a sober respect for the immensity of the difficulties. This is the place for a steadfast courage and a calm wisdom. This is a place for recognition of the tremendous necessity for a more stable peace, if it is within the capacity of humanity to achieve it. This is the place for the glint of a deep knowledge and a deep compassion as well as for the glint of steel. We have that kind of man in John F. Kennedy. <sup>to have the</sup> ~~We have the~~ kind of President who stands and talks as though he belongs in that place.~~

*It is not going to be easy to change the gears in foreign policy*

~~This Administration has acted to strengthen the defenses of the nation and cut the waste in the Defense Department through the outstanding work of the brilliant and courageous Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. This Administration has acted, too, with vigour to overhaul the diplomacy of the nation, to begin to intensify the search for the strengthening of both our freedom and peace in the world. And may I say that in establishing a Disarmament Agency, this Administration has taken an essential step to see to it that when and if that day comes when the world can begin to beat the swords into ploughshares, our industry and manpower which has been diverted to arms production will be able to shift to the constructive work of peace without disastrous personal dislocation and suffering. This Administration is not building from scratch in foreign policy but on what~~



- 12 -  
**COPY**

has gone before because foreign policy does not stop when one administration ends and another begins. In this matter, former President Eisenhower and other Republicans deserve full credit for their contribution because when it comes to foreign policy, we are not and ought not to be either Democrats first or Republicans first but Americans first and foremost.

It will take time before the effects of the changes in foreign relations are felt under this Administration. It will not be easy to bring these changes about. It will not be cheap. Foreign aid will have to go on. Tens of billions of dollars will continue to be spent each year for the armed forces. Billions more will go into space exploration. The President does not enjoy spending this money, as we have been doing for years, anymore than you like to have it come out of your earnings. But that is the price of cold war, of the world's fears and anxieties. It is the price of the survival of freedom and the integrity of this nation in a time of world-wide upheaval, uncertainty, aggression and hostility. I can assure you that if any man can lead in the modification of this situation, if any man has the wit to lead in the creation of a more stable world situation, a more durable peace it is the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. If he is going to do it, he will need the understanding, patience and support of the American people. If I know the people of this nation, he is going to get it.

Even now, he is acting to rebuild our neglected relations in Latin America, to hold the line in Asia, to try to come to some sort of sensible agreement to end atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons without danger to national security and to defuse the so perilous situation in Berlin. And

COPY

has gone before because foreign policy does not stop when one administration  
ends and another begins. In this matter, former President Eisenhower

had but not least, he is attempting  
to bring about a great enlargement in  
our international trade - in order that  
the resources of farm, ~~land and~~ <sup>mining and factory</sup> can which we  
have in such abundance can be  
sold abroad in return for what we  
can use from abroad. There are going  
to be some people that are going to  
be hurt in this process but this  
Administration is not going to let them  
bear the brunt of change which is of  
benefit to the entire nation in the long  
run. It is going to proceed carefully  
and with understanding. But we  
have all got to face the fact that  
we can't sell abroad if we are  
not ready to buy from abroad.

understanding patience and support of the American people. If I know

the people of this nation, he is going to get it.  
It is a thing to be understood and negotiated  
in relation to that business, to deal  
with it in Paris, to try to come to some  
kind of reasonable agreement to end this  
hostile business relations without doing  
to national security and to defend it.  
The American situation in Berlin, and



*The President needs the understanding and support of the people of the United States and rights in the world and I am confident he*  
**COPY**  
*And he is going to get understanding and support in Congress, and he is going to get it from men like Joe Clark and Dan Flood*  
John Carroll who has fought the good fight to open up the maximum of equal opportunity for every American child, every businessman, worker and farmer for many years.

John Carroll is famous in Washington as a servant of three great special interests: the American public, the ideal of equal rights for all men; and the people of the Western states. If there are three special interests that are more in your general interest, I don't know what they are. He is three Senators in one: a Senator from Colorado, a Senator of the West and a Senator of all the people of the United States.

Now there are many other men in Congress who share these interests, but John Carroll has accumulated the experience, stature and position which permit him to serve these interests with great effectiveness. He serves the consumer as ranking Democrat on the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, where he was a leader in the recent price fixing investigations into the electrical industry. He serves the cause of equal rights for all men on the Judiciary Committee, and--because, as he will tell you, it is an uphill battle there--he is a principal leader in the floor fights for civil rights. And John Carroll serves the people of the Western States as a member of the Senate Interior Committee--so frequently the make-or-break committee for all of us in the West--and as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals.

COPY

What this adds up to is an outstanding record of service to expanding opportunity: opportunity for the independent businessman to compete with the giants of industry; opportunity for the consumer to buy at a fair price; opportunity for all Americans to live without the encumbrance of prejudice; and opportunity for Coloradans and Montanans and all Westerners to share in the abundance of America's growth. You have in the Senate today, representing you in a position of power and responsibility, a pragmatist, an idealist, a determined man who understands the possibilities of effective government action. You will serve the best interests of Colorado and the United States if you keep him there. As Majority Leader of the Senate, as a Westerner and, most of all, as an American, I urge you to keep John Carroll in the Senate.



REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D., MONTANA)

COPY

at the  
Kingston Armory, Kingston, Pennsylvania

Saturday, May 5, 1962, 6:30 p.m.

I have not come here to persuade you to do what you have already made up your minds to do. This gathering in May can only mean one thing in November. You are going to vote your confidence in President Kennedy and the Democratic Congress. You are going to do it by electing your dedicated Representative, Dan Flood, your outstanding Senator, Joe Clark and other members of our party.

As democrats, it is easy to vote for democrats. But I like to believe and I do believe that Democrats are moved by something more than passion for their party. I like to believe and I do believe that the Kennedy Administration, a Democratic Congress and the Democratic Party have something more to offer the people of the United States than a party label. I believe this nation has a democratic government in office because democrats offer a greater alertness to the problems of a changing nation in a changing world. We offer a vision of a finer future for all our citizens and we offer the energy and leadership to bring that vision to reality. We offer an administration that has begun to move this nation ahead again and has the determination to keep it moving.

COPY

Some of us are democrats because we like the sound of the name. Some of us are democrats because our fathers were democrats. But we are all democrats because we have the sense to see the world and the nation as it is. We are all democrats because we have the vision of a nation growing in the strength, in the unity, in the equality and in the vigour of all its people in the years and decades to come. We are all democrats because we are not prepared to stand pat. We are all Democrats because we would not turn back the clock even if we could.

Even in a partisan meeting of this kind, I think we have to recognise it is not only Democrats who can be described in these terms. There are others. But I do say that there is a significant difference between a Republican Administration and a Democratic Administration in Washington. I do say that there is a difference in a Republican-controlled and a Democratic-controlled Congress. I do say that any honest examination of the record of the 8 years of the previous Administration and the one year and several months of this Administration will reveal that difference. I do say that the principal difference lies in seeing today as it is and tomorrow as it is likely to be, of looking ahead rather than behind, of discerning what we have gained instead of bemoaning what we have not really lost. I do say that on a whole range of domestic questions we have moved forward prudently and rapidly. I do say that there has been a redoubled effort to strengthen both our security and the prospects for peace in the world. I do say we have

COPY

made a beginning on meeting the accumulated social and economic needs of the people of the United States. As citizens, even more than as Democrats, we have a responsibility to invite all Americans, of whatever inclination, to vote their confidence in this advance by their choices in the November election.

You are entitled to know, the people of this state and the nation are entitled to know, some of the principal facts about this advance. Let's start with unemployment. I don't have to tell you anyone than I have to tell the people of my own state about this problem. The mines everywhere have been particularly hard hit by it. This area, if I am not mistaken is in the 10% plus bracket in unemployment. Nation-wide we have several millions out of work. That has been the situation, a little better, a little worse, for many years.

Now, Republicans, no less than Democrats, know that it is not good for a man to be out of work and without resources. It is not good for the man, his family or the nation. Where, then, is the difference? The difference is that this Administration believes there is a public responsibility to do something about this difficulty and accepts that responsibility. The difference is that this Administration recognizes that no man will ever be really secure in his own work unless all men and women who are able and willing to work can find work. The difference is that this Administration does not hide its concern behind glowing statistics



# COPY

of progress which have no meaning for the man without a job or the man whose job doesn't pay enough for a minimum livelihood, or the man about to lose his job in the very process of progress. This Administration does not take refuge in the hope that vague, so-called natural economic forces will act to overcome these difficulties. It asks what becomes of the man in the meantime? A question like that can only be answered by action and this Administration and a Democratic Congress have acted. We have acted to extend unemployment compensation insurance. We have provided aid to the dependents of the unemployed. We have increased minimum wages.

Yet, this Administration recognizes that these measures are largely in the nature of a stop-gap. These measures relieve the immediate adverse effects of unemployment but they do not get at the heart of the problem. And it is at the heart of the problem of unemployment that we are aiming. Democrats aspire to an America in which all Americans of all ages who want to work will never know the fear or the actuality of being out of work through no fault of their own. We have a long way to go. This challenge is not going to be met overnight, in a month, in a year. But I can assure you of one thing: I know that the President, a democratic Congress and the democratic party are not going to rest content until it is met. We have made a beginning about which you in this community have some first-hand knowledge. Your Congressman was a key figure in the Area Redevelopment Act. He drove for the Flood-Douglas bill in the House,

COPY

just as Joe Clark fought for it in the Senate. The President, I believe, singled out this area of Pennsylvania as the number one depressed region of the nation and if I am not mistaken Luzerne County received the first federal grant under the program.

I know that that is the kind of honor every section of this country wishes that it did not have to have. But the way to end a difficulty is to face it and to act on it. You have seen the beginning of action on depressed areas, thanks to a democratic President and a democratic Congress and you will see more action. You will see it in the Manpower Training Act which the Congress has recently passed. If we are not going to leave areas in permanent depression, we most certainly are not going to leave men and women to stagnate in the backwash of rapidly changing patterns of industry, and in the increasing bypass of the unskilled or surplus skilled by the spread of automation. This administration has begun to probe in depth, for the first time, the full implications of that word automation. The President has labeled it the foremost challenge of our times and set the best brains he can find to work on it.

Automation is a challenge which is as full of promise in the long run as it is ominous in the short run. As Democrats, we are determined that the benefits of this great advance--and it is a great advance--will be spread throughout the population and not just to a few. We are determined that the sacrifices, the human price of this advance, and, there is a heavy human price--will be borne by all and not just the man or woman who labors for a livelihood.



# COPY

There are other fields in which this Administration is trying and will continue to try to move the nation forward. In housing, we have acted and we will continue to act to the end that decent shelter will be within the reach of all. In the extension and improvement of the highways and airways we have acted and will continue to act to meet today's urgencies and to anticipate the needs of tomorrow. In developing the great natural resources of this country, in improving the supplies of water through pollution control, in setting aside large areas of our natural heritage of forest, river and coast for the recreation of the people, we have acted to meet the needs of today and tomorrow and we will continue to act. In encouraging small business and helping to improve its competitive position we have acted and will continue to act because we believe small business is the leaven which keeps the economy of the nation flexible, creative and growing.

Insofar as big business and big labor are concerned, the actions of both have a profound effect on the stability and orderly growth of the nation's economy. This Administration has no quarrel with either. Nor will there be any quarrel, so long as both--not one or the other but both--fulfill their responsibilities, not only to their stockholders or their members but to the nation. The President is determined that these responsibilities shall be met. I think we all now have a pretty clear idea that he is going to do whatever he can to see that they are met.



# COPY

Still ahead of us is the challenge to improve the educational structure of this nation from top to bottom. We will not rest content until every boy and girl has an opportunity to be schooled, in excellence, to the limits of their capacity and ambition, regardless of where they may happen to be born and regardless of family financial conditions. This improvement is essential to the security and continued progress of the nation. It is basic to the achievement of all the ideals which are our common heritage.

Ahead of us, too, is the battle for decent hospitalization and related care for the older citizens of this nation. It is not that the other party does not recognize that people get old and get sick and frequently need expensive care which millions cannot afford. I do not know of anyone in public life who does not recognize at least some of these common facts. The difference is that this Administration and the Democratic Party are determined to do what must be done to see to it that all older citizens get that care as a matter of right and not as a matter of charity, that they get it by public insurance, by social security and not by chance or charity. We are determined that they get it not as a reluctant handout but with the dignity befitting Americans. And we are running into a familiar resistance in trying to get it. We are in the same old battle of the 1930's, with the same arguments which were advanced then by some who professed their sympathy for the old people but then voted against

COPY

the social security retirement insurance program.. Yet, who would change social security now? Who would stop the flow of those hard-earned monthly retirement cheques? Who would suggest that we shift this successful system of retirement insurance to hundreds of private insurance companies? Who would want to force millions of older citizens to go back to the good old days before Social Security? I can tell you that this Administration has no intention of going back to those days. This Administration is determined to move further away from them. It is determined to extend social security retirement insurance to cover hospitalization and related care to all older Americans. And, may I say that we would welcome an assist from Republicans in Congress. What we have gotten so far is a confusion of the question by the addition of catch words like socialized medicine and private insurance. But you know and I know that the present social security system works and has worked for almost a quarter of a century. A system of hospitalization for older people, built, essentially, around the same social security approach can work just as well. That is what the President wants and that is what the Democratic Leadership is going to try to get. When this issue reaches a climax--as it will in the near future--bear in mind that just about everybody is likely to be for hospital aid for the older folks. But the real issue is going to be the social security approach that is tried and proven as against money-making schemes of hospitalization, labeled private but paid for by the government, which means by you--schemes which might or might not prove effective.

# COPY

These are some of the facts that the voters of this state and the nation are entitled to have. These are the domestic issues--the common sense issues--which we have got to face as a nation. Republicans in general stand on one side of them. Democrats in general stand on the other. And I do not have to tell you which is which.

Clearly, each issue does not affect every citizen in the same way. A man out of work worries more about unemployment than a bank president. Families whose income permits them to pay for a first-class education for their children on up through business school, an engineering degree, medical school or law school or whatever may not be so directly concerned with the condition of the educational establishment of the nation. Pennsylvanians may be too busy thinking about their own situation to worry about unemployment in Montana. New Yorkers have so many urban problems that they can't be expected to be concerned about the desperate need for irrigation in rural parts of California.

But let us never forget--Pennsylvanians, Montanans, New Yorkers or Californians--that we are one nation. And what strengthens any part of this nation in the long run strengthens the whole. What hurts any part of the nation, if it is ignored by the rest, sooner or later hurts us all. We will either stand together in common sacrifice for the advance of all Americans, for the common benefit, or we will, sooner or later, pay separately the price of selfishness, drift, neglect and sectionalism.



COPY

In no other place will this price be higher than in its impact on this nation's place in the world. The arena of international relations is the entire globe. Even now, it is an arena which is expanding to encompass the moon and the planets. In this vast arena, the struggle for peace and for national security is a far more complex affair than all of the domestic challenges put together. This is no place for quick and quick solutions. This is the place for sobriety, for caution, and for a respect for the immensity of the difficulties. This is the place for a steadfast courage and a calm wisdom. This is the place for sober recognition of the tremendous necessity of all peoples for a more stable peace. This is the place for the glint of a deep knowledge and a deep compassion as well as for the glint of steel.

This Administration is not building from scratch in foreign policy. It is building on what has gone before because foreign policy does not stop when one administration ends and another begins. An administration inherits, in foreign policy, all the mistakes as well as all the achievements of the administrations which have preceded it. In this matter, former President Eisenhower and other Republicans deserve full credit for their contribution because when it comes to foreign policy, we are not and ought not to be either Democrats first or Republicans first but Americans first and foremost.

- 11 -  
COPY

It is not easy to shift gears in foreign policy. It will take time before the effects of changes in foreign relations are felt under this Administration. It will not be easy to bring changes about. It will not be cheap. Foreign aid will have to go on. Tens of billions of dollars will continue to be spent each year for the armed forces. Billions more will go into space exploration.

The President does not enjoy spending this money, as we have been doing for years, anymore than you like to have it come out of your earnings. But that is the price of cold war, of the world's fears and anxieties. It is the price of the survival of freedom and the integrity of this nation in a time of world-wide upheaval, uncertainty, aggression and hostility. I can assure you that if any man can lead in the modification of this situation, if any man has the wit and wisdom to lead in the creation of a more stable world situation, a more durable peace, it is the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. He will need the understanding, patience and support of all the American people and if I know the people of this nation, he is going to get it.

Even now, he is acting to rebuild our neglected relations in Latin America, to hold the line in Asia, to try to come to some sort of sensible agreement to end atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons without danger to national security, and to defuse the perilous situation in Berlin. And last, but not least, he is attempting to bring a great enlargement in our international trade--in order that the resources of

- 12 -  
COPY

farm, mine and factory which we have in such abundance can be sold abroad in return for what we can use from abroad. Some people will be hurt for awhile in this process but this Administration is not going to let them bear the brunt of change which is of benefit to the entire nation. This Administration wants to proceed carefully and with understanding and with special consideration for those who might be temporarily hurt. But we have all got to face the fact that we can't sell abroad if we are not ready to buy from abroad. We have all got to face the fact that international trade is now an integral part of our hope for economic stability and advance in the years to come. We will realize this hope only as we are able to expand both our buying and selling with other nations.

I have tried to give you a picture of what your democratic party has done and is trying to do in Washington. Take that picture to the voters in November. Take it to them in all honesty for we need have no fear of the people if they understand it in all honesty. Take it to them and they will put men in office, democrats in office, democrats who will work with a mind of their own, with something to contribute themselves and at the same time in close cooperation with the President for the benefit of the entire nation and all its citizens.



May 21, 1962

MAIN FILE COPY  
DO NOT REMOVE

REMARKS OF MRS. MIKE MANSFIELD

Gala Dinner of Democratic Women  
Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.  
Monday, May 21, 1962, 7:30 p.m.

~~The wife of a public figure is introduced by her husband.~~

Many of you, as wives, have glowed through the experience of being presented to an audience by your husbands. We stand. We smile. We sit down. Rarely are we called upon to say anything at all. If we are, it is usually not much more complex than "I am happy to be here." Tonight there is a unique opportunity to reverse the situation. The shoe is on the other foot and it is a high-heeled shoe.

In listening to the other introductions by the Kitchen Cabinet and in contemplating what I might say myself, it occurred to me that we are in a unique position to speak for all the wives who have been introduced by all the husbands over the years, decades and centuries.

How should we begin, then? Should we begin: "The men, God bless them!" Or should we say: "We can't do without them but we can't do without them." Or perhaps: "The real credit for all we women are and all we hope to be belongs to our unsung and unassuming husbands."

There is, as I said, a rare opportunity here. But after mulling over these possible beginnings, I believe I shall pass over it.

I shall pass over it because no matter how inept the words which are sometimes used by husbands to introduce wives, I think we wives in our hearts understand the spirit which moves the words.

- 2 -  
COPY

I understand it in the man whom I am about to present to you. I have understood it for a quarter of a century. I have understood it in the miner, the college-teacher, the Congressman, the Senator and the Majority Leader of the Senate. I have understood it most of all in the husband and the father and in the man whose life of service to his country, his family and to others I have been privileged to share through these many years of our times. Therefore, on second thought, I believe I shall return to my accustomed seat beside him and I shall not stir from it again until, at another time and in another place, I hear once again his customary warm and glowing references to me. But, before doing so, let me present to you a man in whom I have the greatest confidence and for whom I have the greatest love and affection. It is a great pleasure to introduce to you Mrs. Mansfield's husband, Mike.

COPY  
INTERFAITH AND TOLERANCE

MAIN FILE COPY  
DO NOT REMOVE

Statement of Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana)

At the Silver Jubilee Award Dinner of the Interfaith Movement, Inc.  
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, New York  
Sunday, June 3, 1962, 7:30 P.M.

We have come together to honor a distinguished member of Interfaith, a distinguished Senator and a friend, Ken Keating. To honor a man is a personal act. Yet, in performing this act, tonight, I believe we are trying to give expression to something greater than our respect and affection for Senator Keating. In saying that, no slight is intended and I am sure that Senator Keating would be the first to recognize it.

For what I am suggesting is that there are ideals which dwarf each of us as individuals. One of these ideals is that of justice and equality and brotherhood in the human family. And when we single out an individual for what he has done in pursuit of it, we are really re-affirming the belief which we hold. We are saying, in effect, here is a man who has tried harder than most to do what we should all aspire to do.

Senator Keating has worked for this belief--this belief in human equality--with the energy, vitality and dedication which he has always had in seeking to strengthen the foundations of the nation's freedom.



# COPY<sup>2</sup>

I have known him since he came to Washington in 1946. I had preceded him by four years. But in Congress four years is only the twinkling of an eye and we were both what is known as junior members of the House of Representatives. Since the senior members in the House pay little attention to junior members, we talked to each other.

We shared an interest in foreign affairs, and a concern about trends in the policies of our recent ally, the Soviet Union. We supported, then, as we do now, those programs--for the military establishment and foreign aid, expensive and frustrating as they sometimes are--that we believed were essential to the survival of freedom.

So while we stood on opposite sides of the political fence, we talked over the fence, then, as we do now. On the one hand we have each done his best to save the country from government by the other's Party. On the other, we have often stood shoulder to shoulder in the Congress when the showdowns have come on fundamental questions of foreign policy and on fundamental domestic questions which determine whether the nation goes forward to greater human achievements, stands still or retrogresses.

Your tribute to Senator Keating this evening does not derive from his voting record in matters of foreign policy and defense. You praise him because of his contributions to human brotherhood, because he has served the cause of amity between men of different faiths. Yet the two principal forks of Senator Keating's activity over the years and decades

COPY

meet on a higher plane. For effective national security policies on an international plane and brotherhood at home are both essential to a free and strong America. And in honoring him for his work in the one you are also, in effect, honoring him for his work in the other.

Tolerance between men of different faiths is a part of the American heritage, so much so that, perhaps, sometimes we forget that it has not been achieved for all and for all times. If it were, there would be no need for a movement such as Interfaith in its present form and dimensions. Yours would be a commemorative society, meeting, perhaps, on July 4th of each year to read the words of our enlightened ancestors.

But in all honesty we must face the fact that full realization of the ideal of human brotherhood still eludes us. The great words are still a challenge to us and not a literal description of our national life. Movements such as yours are still necessary. Men such as Senator Keating must still speak out, with courage and conviction, at those times when our practices do not live up to our preachments.

I should like to make a few observations on the state of tolerance in America--more particularly, on the state of mutual respect. The most tolerant man in the eyes of some people might be one who held no strong beliefs of his own, and to whom beliefs themselves were of no real consequence. Many people in this nation and in the world today are tolerant in this way, either because they have been shocked by the persecution of belief under totalitarian regimes, or because it seems easier to get along



# COPY

when nobody intrudes strong beliefs on anybody else; or simply because the complexity and pace of the modern world makes it hard to hold any firm beliefs at all--for what seemed true yesterday does not hold today.

In any event, the poet's words about the "hollow-men--headpiece filled with straw" are, unhappily, an apt part of the tolerance which exists today. To my mind the tolerance of the headpiece filled with straw is a far cry from the tolerance which is expressed in the phrase: "I do not agree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

I underscore a part of this phrase,--the words "with what you say"-- because it assumes that you have said something with enough weight and conviction to stir up strong disagreement. In the same way, the name of your movement--"Interfaith"-- assumes that you have vested, in something greater than yourselves, your faith, your convictions, your beliefs about the meaning of life. It would be absurd to have an "Inter-tolerance" movement. The Interfaith movement is founded on the assumption that most men do hold beliefs so important to them that they can clash with other beliefs, held just as strongly by others. And that because of this potential clash, men must be reminded of their brotherhood, their common sonship, their deeper human unity under God so that truth may unfold in peace, out of their dissent,



- 5 -  
COPY

There is a parallel to your movement in the democratic form of government, especially as it is written into our Constitution. The Constitution did not envision a nation of conformists, without strong convictions and vital interests. It was written to establish a government where convictions and interests were expected to clash, but where no single idea or interest might deny to others the right to be heard and the right to survive and to participate in the evolution of a nation aspiring to an ever-more perfect union.

This is a difficult ideal to maintain, and I for one hope it will not get any easier. The only way it could get easier, short of the millenium, is by the suppression of dissent. Of course, we have had periods where dissent has made life miserable for the prevailing view, but we have not yielded to the temptation to quash it. We have left that to totalitarian regimes where dissenters were silenced because their convictions were intolerable to the conviction of the state.

Our quest has been for that society where ideas are thrust out in earnest, where their acceptance or rejection has real significance, and where, once accepted, they can be challenged by other ideas without fear of crushing reprisal. The society that can manage this is truly a tolerant society.

# COPY

But neither ideas nor faiths are likely to carry that energy when men "play it cool" because "one belief is just as good as another." In such a world, the real virtue of tolerance does not exist--there is simply nothing to tolerate. Only out of an honest clash of ideas deeply held can come a transcending faith in the dignity of each man, in the necessity to hear him out, to tolerate what seem to be his errors.

Each of us holds a faith that has, at one time in history or another, been persecuted by men who held one of the other faiths. And so we know the value of a society where minority faiths are permitted to live and breathe, where it is the policy of the government and the churches themselves to allow all faiths their voice in the common search for truth. But because this freedom is precious, we should not confuse it with that so-called "tolerance" where nobody feels very strongly about his faith. The kind of tolerance which undergirds the nation and is essential to its form and substance comes out of a man's commitment to his own faith. In the depths of that commitment he will discover his ultimate brotherhood with all others who seek after the truth in their own way.



DO NOT REMOVE

FOR RELEASE JUNE 10, 1962

4:00 P.M., E.S.T.

INTERESTS AND POLICIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Commencement Address by Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana)

Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Sunday, June 10, 1962, 4:00 p.m., E.S.T.

I am happy to be with you and grateful for the privilege of joining the class of 1962. It is especially pleasant to be here because of past contacts with your faculty and, most especially, with my old friend, Ernest Melby, former Chancellor of the University of Montana.

Members of the Michigan State staff are often encountered in Washington and in the far-flung corners of the world. I cannot remember the number of times, for example, that I have run into your Professor Wesley Fishel and my old colleague from Montana, Professor Guy Fox, in Saigon. Together with the rest of the training-mission of Michigan State, they have made important contributions to the Republic of Viet Nam. As for your President, Dr. Hannah, his travel-mileage on behalf of the nation--and, incidentally, Michigan State--is rivaled only by that of the Secretary of State and Members of Congress.

I have heard it said that the sun never sets on the faculty of Michigan State. It is reassuring, therefore, to come here and discover that the faculty has a natural habitat. It is such a delightful habitat one wonders why so many of its members have been persuaded to leave for the enervating tropics of Asia and Washington.

They have been persuaded, I suspect, even as the nation has been persuaded, to enter into new channels of international activity, by the events of the past two decades. The nation has become deeply committed



throughout the world. Skilled members of this university are among the thousands of Americans who are working abroad with great dedication to discharge that commitment.

It is to this commitment, notably, as it is involved in Southeast Asia which I would address your attention. I have chosen this subject, in part, because of the close association which has existed between Michigan State and Viet Nam. I have chosen it, too, in part because events appear to be moving in Southeast Asia towards a point of critical decision. *INSERT*

As you know, we have recently landed combat forces in Thailand. This movement of troops follows the strengthening of the United States military training mission in Viet Nam. Both steps represent a deepening of an already very deep involvement on the Southeast Asian mainland.

In this, as in all cases of foreign policy and military command, the responsibility for the direction of the nation's course rests with the President. It is a grave and difficult responsibility. In discharging it, the President is entitled to the understanding and support of the nation. May I say that he has had both in the Senate of the United States, from the leadership of both parties. He has kept the Congress fully informed on the situation as it has developed. In a similar manner he has tried to keep the people of the nation informed through his frequent press conferences.

Support of the President does not preclude public discussion of the situation in Southeast Asia. On the contrary, it presupposes it. The President would be the last to expect a moratorium on public participation of this kind. It is politics that needs to stop at the water's edge, not serious consideration of the nation's course in its relations with the rest of the world. Rather than less, we need more public consideration of this matter.

# COPY

INSERT PAGE 2

I have chosen it, finally, because I suspect you are sufficiently inspired at this moment not to require an inspirational speech from me. Hence, I shall give you what are, in my opinion, the sober facts of one of the situations which confront the Nation, facts to which you are entitled as mature men and women, as citizens of the United States.



The need is especially acute with respect to Southeast Asia. Until recent times it has been an area remote from the general awareness of the nation. It is not surprising that the public, even today, knows little about the region. Indeed, it is doubtful that a decade ago, more than a small fraction of the civilian and military personnel of the government and the journalists who are now immersed in its place-names could have quickly located the Kingdom of Laos, let alone its towns and villages, on a map of Asia.

Yet this obscure land on the borders of South China now writes headline after headline in the daily press. It keeps the lights on through the night in the Pentagon, the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency. It has been the immediate cause of the dispatch of United States combat forces to Thailand and a partial cause of the strengthening of the military mission in Viet Nam. In a decade about \$400 million in U.S. military and other aid has gone into this one nation whose population is far smaller than that of the Detroit Metropolitan region and is scattered in jungle and hill over an area the size of Oregon.

In 1953 when I first visited Laos, just two junior resident State Department officials were deemed sufficient for the protection of all United States interests in the entire country. Almost a decade later, hundreds of officials from half a dozen federal agencies--military and civilian--were on the scene.

This transition in Laos highlights the transition in the United States relationship with all of Southeast Asia. From a minimum of contact and cost scarcely a dozen years ago we have moved, today, to a point of saturated involvement and immense expense. This progressive involvement has not been a party matter--a republican policy or a democratic policy.



It began under a Democratic Administration. It intensified sharply under a Republican Administration. And it is now being dealt with once again by a Democratic Administration.

The roots of this involvement in Southeast Asia lie in the vast dislocation which was produced in Asia by World War II. But in a more specific sense, it dates from the period of the Korean Conflict.

You will recall that about a dozen years ago revolution swept like a giant tidal wave through China. It spilled over the Chinese borders in the north, into Korea. It gave every sign of engulfing Indo-China to the South. That region, itself, was in the midst of a mixed and confusing Communist-nationalist-monarchist upheaval, but in essentials, a revolution against the reassertion of French colonial control after World War II.

Engaged in the conflict in Korea, we sought for strategic reasons to prevent Chinese expansion in Southeast Asia. So we began to go to the aid, first, of the French and after them, the successor governments of Indo-China--in Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia.

The military situation was eventually stabilized in Korea by negotiations. It was also stabilized in Indo-China largely through the diplomacy which produced the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

A kind of uneasy truce settled over Asia. But there was no change in the deep-seated hostility between Chinese communism and the United States. Peking continued to single us out as the number one enemy of the Chinese people. We continued the policy of wartime boycott of the Chinese mainland--total economic and cultural boycott and almost total diplomatic boycott. The military situation in both the Formosan Straits and Korea remained ominous. The political situation in the divided countries of Laos and Viet Nam remained unsettled.

There followed, then, a United States effort to keep China out of Southeast Asia and to forestall the spread of communism in that region. It was at this point that our direct involvement began to deepen in earnest. We embarked upon a massive military aid program to Southeast Asian nations. All policy was directed preponderantly to the building of strong anti-communist military establishments and governments. We sought, further, to bring the region under the protective umbrella of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, SEATO, which was expected to marshal nations both within and without the area for a common defense of the region against communism.

In Laos and in south Viet Nam, particularly, the immense cost of sustaining the large military establishments built by U.S. military aid required, in turn, large annual economic aid-subsidies to these countries. Neither form of aid has had much effect on the economic or social well-being of the ordinary people of these nations. The principal gain of these programs has flowed to a relatively small number of persons in the cities and to military personnel.

In addition, to this massive military and military-support program of aid, some effort was made to help improve the lot of the ordinary people by technical and other assistance for economic and social development.

Finally, I should mention the extension of the information program into Southeast Asia. Again, the contrast in ten years is significant. From a minor operation confined largely to the environs of the cities of Saigon and Bangkok, the voice of America has been carried by radio and pamphlet and motion picture, by boat, plane, jeep and foot and, I would presume even by elephant, into the remotest villages and hamlets of Southeast Asia. The output of words increased massively and impressively. So, too, of course, did the cost to the people of the United States.



- 3 -

Over a ten-year period, the foreign aid-program--military and non-military--alone has resulted in authorized appropriations of the public funds of this nation of well over \$3 billion for these Southeast Asian nations. This total does not take into account the salaries and expenses of the thousands of military and civilian personnel of the government who have seen service in the area during this period. It does not take into account the cost of our participation in SEATO and consequent military deployments such as has occurred in recent weeks in and around Thailand. It does not take into account the cost of the expansion of the information, programs and other government activity.

Altogether, the commitment of resources to Southeast Asia in a decade has been enormous by any measure. Yet it would be a small price to pay if it were to yield a durable peace and safeguard an opportunity for the growth of stable free nations in that region. Unfortunately, the experience of the past decade is not such as to give rise to sanguine expectations in this respect.

We have the experience of SEATO. It is difficult to assess its value in forestalling military adventures by the Communists. Perhaps it has had some effect; perhaps it has not. But one thing has been made very clear by the recent military deployment. We have allies under SEATO to be sure, but allies either unwilling or unable to assume but the smallest fraction of the burdens of the alliance. I say that not as criticism of any member of SEATO. Each nation has its own problems and capacities and I do not presume to judge them. But this nation, too, has its problems. And one of them is to avoid miscalculations in policies which may derive from the gap between the presumed promise and the actual fulfillment in any military alliance.



We have the experience, too, of Laos. There has been eight years of military and other aid of the most intensive, indeed, the most extravagant kind to that country. There have been millions of costly words and pictures and sounds on the virtues of freedom and the evils of communism disseminated throughout a Kingdom in which, may I say, neither the concept of Western freedom or Western communism can have much meaning. For it is a kingdom of isolated villagers, still living in a relatively contented, peaceful, Buddhist culture centuries old. Eight years of aid and words and other operations, in the end, have produced scarcely a ripple in Laos, except in the capital city. And what it produced there, to say the least, does not speak well for it. Laos is, clearly, in far more danger, today, of a collapse into a kind of communism under outside domination or, perhaps, to division and destruction as a nation, than when this whole process began--when the country was led by one who tried to think and act in terms of the Kingdom's neutralism and greater self-reliance.

*Insert*

We have the experience of Viet Nam. In this situation, after years of military assistance of a most costly kind, it is discovered that the aid went to build the wrong kinds of forces and that it is now necessary to build almost from scratch with the aid of thousands of additional American training and support forces and at an even higher level of annual aid. It is also discovered that a great deal more emphasis on political and economic development is now required in Viet Nam, although the need for this latter course has been pointed out time and again in the Congress for many years.

There is no longer any escaping the fact that after years of enormous expenditures of aid in south Viet Nam, that country is more, rather than less, dependent on aid from the United States. Viet Nam's independent survival is less rather than more secure than it was five or

INSERT PAGE 7

Under the leadership of President Nyo Dinh Diem, a man for whom I have the highest respect and the deepest admiration, a man whose integrity and honesty are unquestioned, and without whom there would be no free Vietnam, that country has faced extraordinary difficulties in its struggle for survival. Yet, even in . . .



six years ago. Once again the bombs explode in Saigon as they have not done since the early days, which Professor Fishel will remember with me, of the establishment of the Republic in 1953-55.

One can only hope that a similar process of increasing dependency and increasing insecurity is not now about to begin in Thailand.

I think, in all honesty, that we must contrast these situations with those which exist in Burma and in Cambodia. Burma has a non-communist independence which is, at this moment, more secure than that of Laos and Viet Nam. Yet it has obtained little aid from us. Cambodia has received from us a fraction of the per capita aid which has gone to Viet Nam or Laos. It has received aid from many countries, including Communist countries. Yet, its non-communist independence is certainly not less, it is far more secure than that of Laos. Indeed, it is, as of this moment, among the most peaceful and stable of all the nations of Asia.

Now, I think we must realize that situations differ in these various nations. Communist and other pressures--internal and external--vary. So do historic and strategic circumstances. But it is not without significance in our comprehension of the total situation in Southeast Asia that in nations in which our aid-commitment has been relatively limited, the prospects are no worse for the survival of non-communist independence than in those in which we are massively committed.

Before this phenomenon can yield anything of relevance to policy, however, we must get clearly in mind the interests of this nation in Southeast Asia which we are trying to protect. For, I presume, that it is on the basis of these interests that we have made this great commitment.



A nation's interests are of two kinds--those which are basic and enduring and those which are transitory and peripheral. And history indicates to us that our enduring interests in Southeast Asia are limited. History also indicates to us that these limited interests in commerce, culture and security have been, in the past, most effectively safeguarded by a policy of minimum involvement. We have, in the past, avoided interfering in the internal political affairs of the Southeast Asian nations. We have, in the past, minimized our military commitment on the Southeast Asian mainland--even during the grimmest days of World War II. We have, in the past, given appropriate encouragement to the emergence of independent nationhood in the region. We have, in the past, sought to act in a fashion which would not tarnish the symbol of freedom and human decency which this nation has long been in Asia or alienate the friendship of the peoples of that region, regardless of what governments might temporarily hold sway over them. We have, in the past, through diplomacy, sought to do our small share in the preservation of peace in that region as part of our general interest in the maintenance of world peace.

I do not see that these enduring interests have changed in any significant degree. Our commercial and cultural contacts with Southeast Asia are still limited. Our security interests in Southeast Asia, in terms of the defense of the United States are still limited.

Yet, it is obvious that in the past decade the policy of minimum involvement and, incidentally, minimum cost, by which we have traditionally defended these limited interests, has shifted about 180° to the point of very deep involvement and enormous cost.

I have already pointed out how the Korean conflict precipitated this drastic change in course in Southeast Asia. How we reached the present point is understandable. The question which we have not yet faced, the question

which may now be approaching the point of critical decisions is whether this change is to become a permanent part of our foreign policy. If it is, then we must be prepared, at best, to carry an annual burden of several hundred millions of dollars of military and economic subsidies to anti-communist governments in the region for many years. We will have to do that whether or not they are responsive governments in terms of their own peoples needs. We must be prepared to extend this support in Southeast Asia for the indefinite future through the whole costly mechanism of aid and propaganda. We must be prepared to bear the human and material cost of keeping an indeterminate number of combat troops in that region, on garrison duty or for more serious purposes as may be necessary. All these things we must be prepared to do at best. At worst, we must be prepared for a possible conflict of indefinite depth and duration, dependent largely on our forces for its prosecution.

These are the facts, the realities of the situation. Grim as they are, I believe that it is eminently desirable that they be faced now, whatever our decisions may be.

In all candor I must ask: Is a permanent policy of that kind justified on the basis of any enduring interests of the people of the United States in Southeast Asia? Is it more valid now, than in the past, to involve ourselves in internal political situations in the countries of that region--to maintain any government in a state of quasi-dependency on us for the indefinite future? Is it more valid now, than in the past, to assume the primary burden for the political, economic and social future of these lands?

I have raised these questions and I would anticipate that you might raise others. The fact is that these approaches are, at best, doubtful because



they are immensely costly in ratio to any enduring interests of the people of the U.S. in Southeast Asia. They are doubtful because, in the long run, they will yield little to the people of this nation and little to the people of Southeast Asia except a multiplication of their already immense social and economic difficulties. These approaches are doubtful because they bring upon us a vague responsibility for the internal evolution of the nations of Southeast Asia, a responsibility which no nation can discharge for another in this day and age, a responsibility which it is the right and duty of the people and leaders of those nations themselves to assume, a responsibility which, after many costly decades, we relinquished in the Philippines with no intention of assuming elsewhere.

While these approaches are doubtful, there is not assurance that they can be avoided. We have accumulated binding treaty commitments over the years and integrity demands that these be honored. Moreover, one cannot know what other nations may do in this situation; and at this late hour any improvement in the situation depends on the attitudes of many governments. It depends heavily on the Chinese in Peking. It depends heavily on the Soviet Russian government. It depends on political and military leaders in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in Asia. Indeed, it depends on all governments which by reason of their membership in the United Nations have a measure of responsibility for the maintenance of peace wherever it may be threatened.

But let there be no doubt that it also depends on us. Regardless of these other factors, it remains for us, now, to draw clearly the distinction between what is enduring and basic and what is transitory and peripheral in our interests with respect to Southeast Asia. It remains for us to hold fast to the one and seek actively to minimize the other, to the end that the



haphazard commitment and waste of resources in which we have indulged for years in the pursuit not only of our enduring interests but of political slogans and shibboleths may cease.

To the extent that we do what we ourselves must do, I believe we shall begin to discern the basis for a new approach to policy in Southeast Asia. It will be an approach which will:

(1) explore actively, intensely and continuously every possibility of minimizing the unilateral activity of the United States in Southeast Asia in every sphere;

(2) re-examine SEATO in the light of the recent experience in Thailand and not hesitate to attempt to modify or alter it, if other ways of maintaining peace and independence in Southeast Asia become evident;

(3) seek vigorously to diffuse, through the United Nations or through any other feasible grouping of nations, the enormous burden of assisting nations of Southeast Asia to bring their economies and social structures more up-to-date;

(4) place less emphasis on political and military subsidies, propaganda and other devices of the cold war and more emphasis on a vigorous and persistent traditional diplomacy for the development of a more stable situation in the area;

(5) pay more attention to the manner in which the reasonable needs and aspirations of the people of the nations of Southeast Asia are being met by their governments in adjusting the whole range of our relations with those governments;

(6) study afresh all the political problems of the region which contain the seeds of expanded conflict, with special attention to the relevance of the experiences of Burma and ~~Laos~~. *Cambodia*.

It is not certain that any of these approaches may be fruitful. The difficulties which have been encountered on all sides in attempting to bring about a peaceful settlement in Laos is indicative of what is involved in any significant change from the present course in Southeast Asia. But difficulties of change, notwithstanding, the fact remains that the present course is, as it has been for a long time, at best, a mark-time course of years and decades of immense cost to the people of the United States and, at worst, it is a collision course.

It is clearly in the interests of this nation to adjust that course if it is at all possible to do so with honor and decency. May I say, further, that this nation owes apology to no nation if it seeks to lighten its commitments in Southeast Asia through a vigorous diplomacy--as we have been doing with respect to Laos--and a much more discriminating and prudent use of its resources. We have done our share, more than our share to sustain friendly governments in Asia. We will go on doing it. We will meet treaty commitments which are binding on our honor. But, at the same time, let there be no doubt that the time is long past due when we must explore every avenue which may lead to a situation in Southeast Asia, less dependent on the resources of this nation for its cement. In the search for that situation the President needs the understanding and support of the nation and I have no doubt that it will be forthcoming.



THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH -- THE SENATE

COPY

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D., MONTANA)

Before the Summer Seminar of College Students

Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, July 10, 1962, 10:00 A. M.

A textbook will reveal how our system of government operates in theory. Only a direct contact such as you are now undergoing can provide the beginnings of an insight into its operation in practice. I say, the beginnings of an insight, on the basis of personal experience. Twenty years in the Legislative Branch, roughly divided between House and Senate have given me, I believe, some understanding of that branch as well as the Executive Branch and the Court. Yet hardly a day passes even now without additional awareness--some new appreciation of the vitality of the Constitution or some new apprehension at the fearful complexity of the system which has developed under it.

I am delighted, therefore, that the President has seen fit to introduce a formal summer internship in government for students. It is typical, may I say, of his dedication to the cultivation of excellence in the public service. You may or may not choose to pursue a career in government in the future. Whether you do or not, I have no doubt that the experiences which you and future groups obtain by first-hand practice will act as a leaven throughout the nation for improvement in the public service. For that reason, if for no other, I am delighted to try to contribute to your understanding of the Legislative Branch--particularly its Senate wing.



COPY

The Senate has been called many things--some flattering some not so flattering. But whatever it has been called, in practice, it is a co-equal half of the Legislative Branch of the government. It is neither an upper body, nor a lower body. It is, with the House, a co-equal body. I stress that point because popular interpretations of the Constitution tend to emphasize the differences between the two wings of the Capitol. Thus, the House is sometimes interpreted as being the more popularly responsive body and the Senate as the upper and the more deliberative and dispassionate body. History indicates, I believe, that the Senate is at least as responsive as the House. And I assure you that the Senate can be at least as passionate as the House. If the Senate is senior to the House in any significant way, it is in the average age of membership; we are undoubtedly a little more decrepit. If it is junior in any significant way, it is in total membership; there are five in Mr. McCormack's organization for each one in ours.

So I repeat, the two wings of the Congress are co-equal, except in certain unique functions which are stipulated in the Constitution. The reason is clear. The basic function of the Congress is to consider and to pass the legislation which becomes the basic law of the land. Congress has exercised powers which are quasi-judicial and powers which are quasi-executive, just as the other branches have exercised quasi-legislative functions. But, basically, Congress exists to legislate and the Congress, as we know it, has no ultimate validity except in the light of that basic function. Neither the House alone nor the Senate

COPY

alone can perform that basic function. The Congress cannot fly on one wing. Only both the Senate and the House, acting together, can perform the basic Constitutional function of the Congress.

We hear much of the importance of divided power in our system of government. But even though we hear much less of it, cooperation and restraint among the elements is of at least equal importance. This importance is starkly revealed when the interplay between the House and Senate breaks down even temporarily as it has done recently between the two Appropriations Committees.

The importance of cooperation and restraint is not confined to relations between the Senate and the House. It applies equally in the relationships between the Executive Branch and the Congress and, even to the relationship of each with the Court. And it applies, too, even within each body. I am sure that many of you have already had some inkling of its importance as among the agencies and offices of the Executive Branch. Within the Senate, in the inner operations of the Senate, it is of the greatest importance. You may be surprised to learn, for example, that by far the greater part of the Senate's day to day business is conducted by unanimous consent or at least without objection of any member. This is the case despite the fact that the Senate is composed of some of the most highly individualistic men and women in the nation--100 Senators of varied personal outlooks and predilection, representing many shades of political opinion and 50 states of varied interests and concerns. This body of great diversity moves as one far more often than not.



COPY

The rules of the Senate are such, moreover, that there exists the greatest latitude for individual assertion and maximum safeguards for the rights of each individual member to make his assertion. With rules so designed, there is a possibility of abuse by any member or group of members. Yet, this abuse is so rare an occurrence that it is newsworthy. It is rare because Members of the Senate, however much they may disagree on specific issues, recognize that the operations of the body--indeed, the survival of the body as a vital element in our Constitutional system--depends, in the last analysis, on a basic cooperation and restraint within the body. How else would the Senate have been able to handle 46,581 confirmations of Presidential appointments, 7 treaties and 570 legislative bills which, at the last count, was the total of completed work since this session of the 87th Congress convened in January?

In terms of the problems of leadership in the Senate, this same element of cooperation and restraint is fundamental. There is, as you know, a Majority Leader and a Minority Leader, as well as assistants to both who are known as the Whips and the Secretaries for each party organization in the Senate. But do not let the word "leadership" deceive you. The Senate is not an army with the leader giving orders and the rest of the troops carrying them out. It is not the Executive Branch whose basic source of power is the President and whose chief personnel serve at his pleasure. Each Senator draws his Constitutional powers directly from the people of his state and is responsible only to those people and to his conscience. Each Senator, in effect, is a party member but he is



COPY

also an independent leader in his own right and is co-equal in rights with every other Senator including the Majority Leader. Each Senator has one vote and in the last analysis it is that vote which counts--not a title.

As I have already pointed out, the rules of the Senate are designed to provide maximum protection for the equal rights of all Senators. Yet if all Senators asserted these rights to the maximum at all times, the body as a whole could not function. Again, therefore, the factor of co-operation and restraint is fundamental to carrying out the responsibilities of leadership in the Senate. In general, members recognize this fact and defer to the leadership most of the time on procedural and routine matters.

In the present situation, with the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch controlled by the same party, I view the principal function of leadership in the Senate as interpreting the President's program to my colleagues, interpreting to the President the attitudes of the Senate with respect to his program and obtaining action--a vote, a decision--on the legislative elements of his program.

There is no guarantee that any particular part of the President's program will be approved by the Senate. There is no magic wand in the hands of the leader. There is no party discipline to insure that the 64 democratic members will invariably vote the President's wishes. Indeed, many measures depend for passage on the vote of Republican members. I am not dismayed by this lack of rigidity in the party structure. Obviously any President, any Majority Leader would prefer the support rather than the opposition of his own party members. But we must recognize the reality that we are a vast land of contrasting interests and concerns

COPY

and party labels have different meanings in different regions. In this setting, legislative action, it seems to me, is best sought by the interplay of these concerns and interests by those who know and represent them most intimately regardless of Party labels.

Nevertheless, there is a minimum party role in the Senate which must be sustained or the labels lose all meaning. The Majority Party role in present circumstances is to bring about at least that measure of cooperation and restraint on the part of individual members which permits decision one way or the other on legislative elements of the President's program in the Senate and the day-to-day disposal of routine business. By the same token, the basic minority party role is to see to it, that this legislation, along with alternatives, is considered fully but without obstructing the taking of timely decisions. By and large, there has been that cooperation and restraint on the part of the individual members in both parties in the present Senate. If you have been led to believe otherwise by press reports, I would note again that that which divides tends to receive the popular stress over that which unites. I have already alluded, for example, to the sheer numbers of Presidential appointments confirmed, the treaties and the bills on which the Senate has acted during the present session. Add to these huge numbers, the totals from the previous session which were 48,961 Presidential appointments, 10 treaties and 1,133 legislative bills. You will gain from these figures some sense of the sheer volume of activity of the Senate, a volume which could not begin to be sustained without the highest degree of cooperation and restraint on the part of the individual members.



# <sup>-7-</sup> COPY

Or look at the record in the light, alone, of the highly significant proposals which the President has advanced since assuming office. During the present Congress--both sessions--perhaps in excess of 275 proposals of this kind have been sent to the Congress by the President. Any one of these represents a major undertaking which properly calls for the most careful and extensive consideration by the Congress. Yet, the Senate has actually passed about 60 of these proposals this session and, during the last session, enacted 124 of them into law. You hear much of the defeat in the Senate of a Presidential proposal to establish an Urban Affairs Department or the rejection of a farm bill in the House. But you hear little of the passage of a manpower retraining bill or of an aid to higher education bill or an extension of unemployment compensation bill or dozens of other highly significant measures.

Whether or not legislation passes in the Senate in response to the President's program is a question which goes, not to the operation of the Senate or the House as such. Rather it goes to the social, economic and political forces continuously at work throughout the nation and the manner in which these forces are reflected in the representation in the Senate at any given time. In these forces there is much that conflicts, much that divides. It is the essence of the legislative function to deal with these forces in terms of the enactment of laws for the common good. And in the exercise of this function, I do want to impress upon you the importance of element of cooperation and restraint.



COPY

It is as important to the internal operations of the Senate and the Congress as it is to the inter-relations of the separate branches in the effective operation of the federal government. It is this element which makes possible agreement to act even where there is strong disagreement among strong men and women as to the proper course of action. It is this element which permits orderly and peaceful change in the structure of our society to meet the ever-changing needs of our people. It is this element which, though unexpressed in a Constitutional sense, nevertheless, is a major source of the validity and vitality of our Constitutional system.

8:00 P.M., E.S.T.

CHANGING EUROPE AND UNITED STATES POLICIESMAIN FILE COPY  
DO NOT REMOVE

Address by Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana)

The Springfield Adult Education Council

Springfield Public Forum, The Phillips Lecture

Technical High School, Springfield, Massachusetts

Wednesday, October 10, 1962, 8:00 P.M.

Although it <sup>will have</sup> ~~has~~ taken an inordinate length of time to complete it, the record <sup>will</sup> ~~shows~~ that the 87th Congress has disposed of a substantial amount of public business. For this work, it will be praised or blamed--at least until early November--depending in no small part, I should think, on one's political predilections. The Congress also failed to get through certain significant items of business. And for this, too, it will be praised or blamed, at least until early November.

In the closing days of the 87th Congress, however, two major measures were cleared. Praise or blame and political predilections, notwithstanding, these measures are of immense importance to the nation.

I refer, first, to the foreign aid appropriation. We may deplore this appropriation as a waste of money, as an invitation to foreign ingratitude or worse. We may praise it as an act of far-sighted humanitarianism or enlightened self-interest.

However we may regard it, there is no escaping the fact that foreign aid is a critical gear in the intricate machinery of



First, let me say that in the remarks I will make tonight, I will be speaking in my capacity as a Senator of the United States and not as the Majority Leader of the U. S. Senate.



the nation's foreign relations. It has continued to turn, more or less adequately, for many years and through several administrations of both political parties. It is no overstatement to say that if the Congress had removed the gear or crippled it by denying an ample appropriation it would have risked bringing down the entire structure on which the peace and security of the nation has rested for many years. Faced with that reality, more than a sufficient number of Senators and Representatives were inclined to the course of prudence with respect to this program. Members of both parties acted to sustain the security and peace of the United States.

This is not to say that misgivings were absent on the part of members who voted for foreign aid. Many entertained serious doubts about one or more aspects of the aid-program. May I say, in all frankness, that I personally share some of these doubts.

I do not believe, for example, that we can or should accept as satisfactory for the indefinite future a course of foreign policy which places great reliance on a continued outflow of dollar grants to other nations. Nor do I believe that we should accept by force of habit a course of sustaining the independence of nations elsewhere by maintaining aid-dependent governments in a style to which they may have become accustomed. Nor do I believe that the long-range interests of this nation are served by casting aid for the economic development of emergent nations, a problem which has a rationale of its own, in the framework of a competitive struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union.

But the intelligent resolution of these and other doubts does not lie in the sudden smashing of the gear of foreign aid with all that that implies to the total machinery of foreign policy and, hence, to our peace and security. I believe, rather, that we must look for the resolution of the doubts in a continuing alertness to the changing realities of the international situation. We must look for it in constructive adjustments in the foreign policies by which we seek to deal with these realities. And we must look for it, finally, in a continuous re-ordering of both objective and administration in the aid-program itself, as circumstances elsewhere and at home change. In these ways we may anticipate, with some realism, the day when the dependency of others on the more dubious and costly elements of the aid-mechanism may come to an orderly end. Indeed, we may look forward to the day when the dependency of our own policies for peace and security on these same dubious elements may also come to an orderly end.

For this reason, among others, it seems to me that the President's new trade policy is the most important act of the recent session of the Congress. This first major revision of foreign trade policy since the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Program a quarter of a century ago places in the hands of the President authority to deal effectively with recent changes in the patterns of international trade. The program has great significance for the continued growth of our own domestic economy, for that growth is now interwoven with an expanding overseas trade. But even greater, perhaps, are the possibilities which are opened by the new trade program for placing



our security and well-being on a more stable and equitable and, hopefully, a less costly basis than that which now prevails.

In this latter connection, the new trade law bears a direct relationship to the focus of tonight's discussion. It has particular relevance to Europe, to a changing Europe, and to our relations with that region.

I have already referred to the need for a continuing alertness to the evolving situation abroad. It is essential to effective foreign policy that we do not imprison ourselves in a self-fashioned cage of outworn facts and ritualistic slogans. Certainly, we ought not forget the experiences of the past. But, equally, we must be alert to the realities of the present and try our best to anticipate the needs of the future.

This alertness is most essential with respect to Europe. For Europe has long been at the core of our foreign policies, and Europe is changing rapidly. It is changing, moreover, in ways which are likely to require adjustments in policies on a scale more extensive than any we have known in the past decade.

We cannot yet define the adjustments which may be desirable, possible, or, indeed, inevitable in the years ahead. Our policies interact with the policies of other nations and the courses which they take will surely affect our own. But we will discern the lines of adjustment, and we shall have a better chance to formulate effective adjustments as we deepen our understanding of what is presently transpiring in Europe.



Those of you who have traveled from time to time on that continent may have been struck by the obvious manifestations of change over the years. Indeed, a great change is readily evident in such simple matters as the progressive improvement in the dress of the people and the worsening of the traffic problems in the major European cities. It is evident in the copious availability of food and other consumer goods, in the general intensity of commercial and industrial activity.

The present look of Western Europe, to one who saw it ten or fifteen years ago, is that of a booming prosperity. And, indeed, the economic indicators sustain the apparent. Western Europe is prosperous, and it is dynamic. It is producing, investing, trading--internally and externally--and consuming at unprecedented levels.

There is a general belief that this dynamism is due to the Common Market. The fact is that much of the economic momentum was generated in the European countries on an essentially national but cooperative basis, even before the Market arrangements began to go into effect. We may anticipate, therefore, that there is much more to come if the Common Market continues to live up to its initial promise and, if the cooperative concepts of the Market are extended outward to other nations.

In any event, the atmosphere of Western Europe in 1962 makes it difficult to recall the Europe of 1945--the devastated Europe, stunned by long years of privation, by the incredible brutality and massive destructiveness of the war. It is difficult, even, to recall the Europe of 1950 or 1951--the Europe struggling to its feet with the help of the Marshall Plan.

Difficult though it may be, it is essential that we recall these earlier Europes. For it was in those settings that our basic postwar comprehensions of the European situation were formed, comprehensions which persist to some extent even today although circumstances have changed greatly.

We saw Western Europe, then, as hurt almost beyond help, threatened by revolutionary upheaval from within and aggression from without. We saw Western Europe dependent on this nation for its very subsistence, let alone the revival or survival of its freedom. And after the Berlin blockade, we saw Europe, as a whole, split beyond any expectation of healing between the monolithic oppressive Stalinist system in the East and the reviving free nations of the West. And we saw, in a divided Germany the wedge of a deepening division in a nation and a continent.

Throughout the early postwar years, our policies were reasonably attuned to the realities of the European situation. They were policies which could produce more and more vehement slogans of liberation, more and more speeches in the Congress on liberation, but, unfortunately, not the actuality of a liberation in Eastern Europe, as we saw with striking clarity at the time of the Hungarian uprising. But they were policies which, with less and less fanfare, were appropriate to the restoration of Western Germany, the recovery of Western Europe and to the protection of its renewed vitality and freedom.

Western Europe readily accepted our leadership in those years. Cynics might note that the Europeans had little choice. But I prefer to think that our leadership was accepted in major part because it was an understanding , effective and responsible leadership. We



pursued policies which Western Europeans recognized as serving their interests and policies which served our own interests, by safeguarding the security, the peace, the progress--the essential well-being--of the people of the United States, at a realistic and bearable cost.

As I have noted, attitudes tend to persist even after the circumstances which give rise to them have changed. National policies and administration are subject at least to the same inertia. If we would deal effectively with the Europe of 1962, therefore, we must now grasp firmly the fact that we are no longer dealing with the Europe of 1945 or 1950. In Western Europe, we are no longer dealing--to be blunt--with the gaunt and shabby economic dependent, the shocked, tottering and willing dependent of the earlier years. On the contrary, Western Europe, today, is on its feet and has been for several years. More, it is running.

Indeed there are certain aspects of the change which has taken place which border on the ironic. European currencies, for example, were once in little demand in the international financial markets. Some of these currencies are now in relatively greater demand than our own. Not so long ago we legislated inducements to encourage American enterprise to invest in Western Europe and found very few takers. Now we are concerned and properly so by the great outflow of American capital to that region, and we are seeking to stimulate Western European investment in this country as a partial counterbalance. Once we were badgered for loans by Western Europeans. In recent years we have been seeking a speedup in repayment of various obligations and what is more, the Europeans have been repaying in advance. Once we



placed abroad, as far as possible, orders for arms and munitions and other materiel for NATO. Now, we are pressing the European allies to make their military purchases in the United States as a means of obtaining foreign exchange to off-set the dollar-outflow involved in keeping our military forces in Europe.

I do not cite these examples in dismay or alarm. The recovery and prosperity of Western Europe were the ends which we sought because our national interests are interwoven with these ends. Moreover, the international financial position of the United States is one of great reserves and in the past year this position has apparently strengthened. I cite the unusual and ironic turnabouts, rather to indicate the extent to which economic circumstances have changed in Western Europe.

The transition has not been sudden. And as it has taken place, our policies--sooner or later--have generally adjusted to the changes. Some of the examples which I have just cited are representative of specific adjustments. But in more general terms, we might note that the policies of postwar relief to a stricken Europe, the postwar loans, the Marshall Plan, have long since passed into history. With the exception of Spain, no economic aid of any kind has been extended to Western Europe for several years.

From one-sided economic aid, in short, we have progressed to a vastly expanded two-way trade--regular commercial trade. This trade has flourished, and it now encompasses one-third of our total trade, \$6.3 billion in exports to Western Europe, and \$4.7 billion in imports from Western Europe in 1961. Compare these figures with a pre-war trade which, in 1938 stood at \$1.2 billion in exports and \$474 million in

imports. Apart from its other virtues, the Marshall Plan was a key factor in bringing about this immensely and mutually advantageous growth in trade.

It is doubtful, however, that we can coast indefinitely in this satisfactory situation even if we so desired. It is not likely that we shall be able to avoid difficulties in the period ahead in our relations with Western Europe. The basic question which is looming is whether a surge forward in Western cooperation, notably in trade, is now possible, indeed, necessary.

The major decisions in this connection cannot long be avoided. Indeed, Western Europe is moving towards them largely on a self-generated momentum. The Inner Six countries--Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg--are impelled by the high initial effectiveness of the Common Market into a speedup in the removal of economic impediments as among themselves. As a group, moreover, they are at a point at which there will be a significant step forward in the freeing of trade with nations outside the Market or the heightening of restrictions on that trade. Moreover, the very success of the Common Market appears to be serving as a stimulus to integrated and quasi-independent European action on other matters, particularly on the part of the core nations of Western Germany and France. And the resolution of the Algerian question is likely to increase this stimulus.

Britain and other Western European nations linked in the Free Trade Area commonly called the Outer Seven, are also carried toward major decisions largely by the significance of the Common Market to their trade. They are drawn by both the great promise and the uncertain



prospects with which the Market confronts them. And finally, we are impelled towards major decisions not only by considerations of trade but because of the key position which all of Western Europe--and a changing Europe--occupies in the structure of policy upon which our peace and security depends.

We find ourselves, in short, in a period of major transition in Western Europe during which many questions, economic and more than economic, are appearing and demanding answers. We do not yet know all the questions, let alone the answers. For it does not rest with us alone to pose the one or to compose the other.

It is in this context that the action of the Congress in enacting into law the President's new trade program assumes great importance to the nation. In a most responsible and non-partisan achievement and by overwhelming vote the Congress has equipped the President to deal with the several possibilities which are emerging, all of which have great significance for the nation's security, peace and well-being.

It is easy enough to visualize these possibilities in an optimistic light. One might look ahead, for example, to the entry of the United Kingdom and other European nations into the Common Market or, in other ways, the devising of satisfactory trade arrangements between the Inner Six and Outer Seven of Europe so that they will not find themselves at sixes and sevens. One might look ahead, too, to the immense possibilities of trade-growth between this nation and all of Western Europe, through the reciprocal removal of trade barriers,



in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, under the General Agreement for Tariffs and Trade and in other ways.

Indeed these optimistic possibilities are now open. But in all realism we must recognize that they are not the only possibilities. In this connection, I would point to the difficulties which have arisen in the course of British negotiation for membership in the Common Market. It is understandable that there should be difficulties and cautions on both sides in these negotiations. But the hesitations should not be dismissed by the glib assertion that it is just a matter of Britain "wanting the cake and eating it too." There is more involved--much more.

And much of what is involved is concerned with the Commonwealth. We will do well to remember that the Commonwealth, whatever its shortcomings, remains a significant factor for restraint and order and the evolution of freedom in a world which is never far from chaos and filled with tyranny. It is to be hoped, therefore, that arrangements will be devised which permit reconciliation of new British ties with Western Europe with the maintenance of the Commonwealth. For such a reconciliation may well decide whether present trends in Western Europe will turn inward or outward, towards seclusion or inclusion, in the direction of fragmentation or toward more effective cooperation among all the free nations in meeting the worldwide problems of freedom.

If the coming transition in Western Europe will require adjustments in our economic policies it is not unlikely that it will require adjustments in political and defense policies. Again, it is possible to view the possibilities in a most optimistic light. We might assume, for example, that the great economic progress of Western Europe might

produce a steady closing of political as well as economic ranks and the development of more effective common approaches towards Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and towards all the issues involved in a common advance of freedom throughout the world. One might also assume the continuation and deepening of military cooperation under NATO, with the Europeans bearing an increased share of its costs in manpower and materiel, commensurate with the improvement in their economic situation.

Yet, we would not see the present situation fully if we did not also note certain tendencies which suggest alternative possibilities. We must note, for example, that Western policies with regard to China and other parts of the Far East are by no means parallel policies, let alone common policies, and the gap which has existed for years shows no sign of closing. That may be understandable inasmuch as the Far East has become increasingly remote from the concern of Western Europe even as it has come closer to ours. But near at hand, we cannot ignore the fact that the profitable trade and shipping enticements which have existed since the breakdown in our relationships with Cuba have proved too much for some NATO members to resist. Again, I suppose one might rationalize this situation by noting that many of the NATO members are maritime nations and, as such, have traditional reluctances or legal restraints against introducing impediments to commerce on the seas, and further, that Cuba is somewhat remote from their immediate interests.

But even more directly, in the North Atlantic relationship itself, a relationship in which, presumably, the security and other interests of the European members are at least equally and probably more at stake, we cannot fail to notice certain anomalous tendencies.



There are obvious differences over nuclear strategy which far from being resolved, appear to be deepening. Further, it is years since NATO established a force goal of thirty divisions in Western Europe. At the present time, however, there are only twenty-three divisions in the region, and so far as I am aware, the only increments to its strength in the past half-decade have come from the United States and West Germany which now supplies half of the European contingent. This is the case despite the fact that economic growth throughout Western Europe would appear to equip the nations of that region to increase their expenditures for the common defense and permit us to reduce ours.

In this instance, we are confronted with an almost inescapable conclusion that the Western European allies are either most lackadaisical about their security or they see the military threat to the North Atlantic region or at least to Western Europe in a far different perspective than do we.

This conclusion, moreover, is reinforced by another anomaly in the current situation. I allude to it by pointing out that much of the discussion of foreign policy in the last Congress, as in its predecessors, revealed a continued deep ideological hostility and security concern with respect to any and all relations with Eastern Europe. The Congressional concern included Yugoslavia and Poland despite the fact the Presidents of both parties throughout the years have urged a somewhat different approach at least to these two Eastern European nations.

With this exception and despite occasional short-lived efforts to improve the tone of United States-Soviet relations--as for example during the Geneva Conference of 1955 and when the "Spirit of Camp David"



prevailed--our relations with Eastern Europe have, in fact, been extremely limited, involving minimal diplomatic and cultural contact and small-scale--in some instances--trivial trade. The closed-door situation in the East European Communist countries, of course, has been a factor in this situation. At the time the Marshall Plan was proposed, for example, the Eastern European governments under Stalin's dictation isolated themselves almost completely from contact with the West. But it is also true that we imposed, as a matter of policy, our own quasi-quarantine on relations with that region and have retained it through the years. The principal motives, apparently, have been a belief that any other course would adversely affect the security of the West and the hope that quasi-quarantine would contribute to a liberation of the Eastern European people from oppressive Communist governments.

In any event, our policies with respect to Eastern Europe have involved stringent trade controls for many years. These controls have acted to keep our commerce with all of the Eastern European countries at a very low level. Exclusive of trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, it has amounted to under \$100 million a year. And the great bulk of the \$100 million consists of trade with the Soviet Union. By contrast, our commerce with Yugoslavia and Poland, unfolding under a somewhat eased policy, came to over \$300 million in 1961.

It would reasonable to assume that a parallel policy towards Eastern Europe would prevail among our NATO allies. They are closer to the source of danger, sharing the control of the continent with the Communist governments. Their stake in the security of the West and the liberation of Eastern Europe would appear at least equal to our own.

But we look in vain, if we look for parallel policies. With the Soviet Union alone, for example, the trade of the NATO nations of Europe amounted to over \$1.5 billion in 1961. And the trade of our NATO allies with Eastern European countries, exclusive of the Soviet Union, in the same year came to a total of over \$2 billion.

Indeed, in the case of West Germany, trade with East Germany has been about \$500 million a year for the past five years. West German trade with the Soviet Union alone amounted to \$400 million in 1961, equal to our total trade with all of Eastern Europe, including Yugoslavia and Poland.

Moreover, the trade figures are a bare-bones indicator of the extent of increasing contact between West and East Europe. Add to it, a growing intra-European tourism. Add to it, the spread of commercial aviation networks until they embrace both parts of Europe and include principal European carriers. Add to it the direct rail service now available between Moscow and Rome, Paris and London. Add to it new credit agreements and sea-going shipping arrangements which facilitate the flow of trade between the two parts of Europe.

What begins to emerge from these and other indicators is a far different portrait of the all-European situation than that which prevailed a decade or more ago, the period in which our general comprehensions were formed and our basic political and defensive policies established. The contemporary portrait hardly suggests a Western Europe cowering with fear before the threat of imminent Soviet invasion, or subversion from Eastern Europe. It hardly suggests a Britain, Germany, France, or Italy which hold that the way to induce change in Eastern



Europe is to isolate it. It hardly suggests Western Europe standing firm or even standing still, insofar as contact with Eastern Europe is concerned.

On the contrary, the current situation appears to be that of a Europe which while it may be separated on ideological lines is finding, through an extensive commerce and other contacts, a tolerable way to live with the division. This is a far different Europe than that which existed at the time our present policies of quasi-quarantine of Eastern Europe were devised. It is a far different Europe than that which is suggested by the situation in Berlin in which the United States and the Soviet Union confront each other in a continuous state of incipient conflict.

It is a Europe, in short, which appears to have changed markedly in a decade, except at Berlin. So much has it changed that it suggests the desirability of a critical examination of both our comprehensions of the situation and the policies which are derived from them to determine whether both may have fallen somewhat behind the times. We will not serve our own interests if we cloak the realities of the present situation in the facts and slogans of the past. Policies persisted in long after circumstances alter risk irrelevancy or worse.

Certainly, we ought never to approach changes in foreign policy lightly. Neither ought we to fear them. We must always be prepared to seek them if, in the light of altered situations, changes may be indicated in terms of our own security, peace and well-being.



In the end, it is the President who has the awesome responsibility of decision in these matters. But I have long believed that any President gains from thoughtful public consideration of foreign policy. Nor is such consideration impossible in this country until after November, as Mr. Khrushchev appears to think. The questions involved in our relations with the rest of the world are not political; they are national. The people of this nation have long since shown a capacity to separate the two and, in time, to deal with those in public life who fail to separate them. It is with continued confidence in that capacity, therefore, that I suggest to you some aspects of the European situation and our policies, which are in need of thorough and dispassionate public examination.

1. It does not seem to me unreasonable, for example, to anticipate that the impact of the economic transition in Western Europe is bound to be felt, not only in economic matters, but throughout the structure of Western cooperation. It seems to me, further, that our once preponderant position of responsibility must evolve into a greater sharing of responsibility in line with the diminishing differences between the basic capacities of the Europeans and ourselves as the effect of World War II on Europe recedes into history. There is no failure of leadership in adjustment to this reality. Rather, it is an essential of leadership. It would, indeed, be a failure if we were to cling to an excessive responsibility in Western affairs on a mistaken assumption that nothing has changed and the need for us is little different than it ever was and that special sacrifices on our part must continue. In that presumptive course lies not only unnecessary tension but unnecessary cost and unnecessary risk for the security of our own people.

More suitable to the present, it seems to me, is the course of a less ritualistic pursuit and, at the same time, a more realistic pursuit of interdependence among the Western nations on the basis of a more proximate equality of benefit and sacrifice in our relations. We may begin to find such a course through the new trade program and a great expansion of trade, not only with the Common Market but with all the Western European nations. Certainly, that is precisely what the policy is designed to permit, and I have no doubt that the President will pursue it with vigor. But we need to be prepared for some very hard and difficult bargaining in the days ahead. We must be prepared to look to our national needs with the same frank concern as do others. Unless we are so prepared we may well find ourselves continuing to carry more of the burdens of interdependence while enjoying less of its benefits. We will do well, too, to make certain that the trade interests of Latin America, Japan and other nations with whom close and fortuitous relations are enjoyed, are not shunted aside in the effort to strengthen the ties across the Atlantic.

2. If the beginnings of the adjustments of our course are to be found in the new trade program, they are not likely to end with that program. For, I do not think that we can discount for much longer the existence of Western European concepts of security needs which differ considerably from our own. Nor can we ignore the continued reluctance of Western European governments to increase their sacrifices for the common defense in the patterns which were determined some years ago.



May I say the Europeans have an equal right to their views as to what may presently be necessary to their defense, to the common NATO defense, and every consideration should be given to their views. But equally, we have a right and a responsibility to examine the extent of our commitment to the common defense, particularly in view of the failure to reach the NATO force goals, in view of the consistent balance of payments deficits which we have experienced for several years, in view of the expanded European capacity to bear a larger share of the common costs if they were so inclined, and in view of the enormous burden of assistance which we have carried and are carrying, largely alone, with respect to other areas of the world. It would appear to me that, at the least, the time is already past due when the remaining military aid-programs to Western Europe should follow the economic aid programs into history. Nor is it unreasonable to consider a <sup>future</sup> reduction in our expensive ground-force commitment to Europe--both in manpower and in dollars--if a reduction might be negotiated for a reciprocal withdrawal of Soviet forces from Eastern Europe. Any such reduction is, of course, inseparable from a satisfactory and enduring resolution of the Berlin question. Otherwise, we would be in the impossible situation of reducing forces in Europe one day only to have to increase them the next.

3. Prospects for any such course are also partially dependent on the situation in Eastern Europe. And it is difficult to speak of the present situation in that region with any precision. Our public sources of information are somewhat limited, to say the least. Nevertheless policies which still derive from an interpretation of that region as



the Soviet monolith which it was in Stalin's day seem to me to be open to question. Certainly, Eastern Europe remains an area of preponderant Soviet influence. Certainly, Communist nations of the region are linked in the Warsaw Pact. But it is hardly accurate to see the Soviet relationship with Finland and with Poland in the same perspective; nor is it valid to equate the Soviet relationship with East Germany and with Yugoslavia, nor the Soviet relationship with Poland and with Bulgaria, Rumania or Albania. Indeed, the latter country has actually severed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and sent its military mission packing!

What meaning, if any, these and other differences in Eastern Europe may have to the peace and welfare of the United States is an open question. But nothing is gained by closing our eyes to the fact that differences do exist or by regarding as sacrosanct policies which derive from earlier assumptions with regard to the region from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

On that basis alone, the policies which we have pursued more or less consistently with all of Eastern Europe except Finland and to a lesser extent with Yugoslavia and Poland for a decade and a half clearly require careful scrutiny. When we consider, further, that NATO trade with Eastern Europe has risen to a level of \$3.5 billion and other East-West European relationships have greatly expanded, while we have continued to maintain a quasi-quarantine, the need for thoughtful review becomes even more evident.

I would reiterate that prospects for an orderly improvement of our policies with respect to Europe or, at least, a safe reduction

in their burdens on the public, are likely to prove remote so long as there is a continuance of the present tension in Berlin.

It is the policy and, by this time, it should be clear to all that it is the policy of the United States neither to be provoked into unnecessary war nor to surrender Allied rights in Berlin to force. Whatever is necessary to assert that policy will be done. But let there be no mistake as to the cost of that situation to this nation. The increase of several billions in the defense budget in the last two years was closely related to it. The call-up of National Guardsmen and Reserve components last year was directly related to it. The grant of standby authority to the President to do the same this year is related to it.

I would point out, further, that the rights which we are seeking to safeguard in Berlin are Allied rights even though the principal responsibility and cost for upholding them has been borne by this nation since 1948. It seems to me that, in the light of the altered situation in Europe, we may properly inquire whether the Berlin situation today is not at least as much a responsibility of the Germans and the Europeans as it is of the United States. We may properly inquire, whether or not in view of the catastrophic implications which this situation contains, it has not become, to some extent, a worldwide responsibility to share.

It would appear to me that we have every right to insist that those whose interests are at least as directly involved as ours bear more equitably the risks and costs which are involved. At the least, it would appear to me that they join in an effort to find a rational alternative to this dangerous and costly situation, by such honorable



means as may be open, be it by diplomacy, be it through the United Nations or through conferences on Germany at which the European nations who may be prepared to contribute, as well as Germans, might be present. Indeed, it is not at all inappropriate that both the United States and the Soviet Union move further back in such negotiations while the Europeans themselves make a greater effort to find answers to the problems posed at Berlin by a divided Germany.

In any event, I do not believe that we should be dissuaded from seeking more rational answers to the Berlin dilemma and related questions by the raised eyebrows or the relatively cost-free reticences of others, so long as we continue to bear the preponderant burden of cost and responsibility.

To stand firm while circumstances move on is not to stand firm at all. It is to recede into irrelevance and a frustrating impotence from which the only escape may indeed be an ignominious retreat or a war of mutual annihilation. The President deserves to be sustained at home and by allies abroad as he engages in an unremitting search for a better answer to the dilemma. And the hour is indeed already very late in Berlin.

I have discussed these matters with you, tonight, notwithstanding the fact that the winds of October have already begun to kindle the political fires of November. I have felt free to do so because these questions of a changing Europe and our foreign policies will be with us all regardless of the outcome of the election.



With the President remains the awesome responsibility of decision. He will have to make the decisions--decisions on which hinge the security, the peace and the well-being of generations. In all frankness, the decisions which are reached with regard to foreign policy are not likely to differ significantly whatever the political composition of the next Congress. In these national matters, I am confident that President Kennedy will continue to have the support of the preponderance of the membership of Congress, as did his predecessor. And I am confident, too, that he will have the preponderant support of the people of the United States.

no mistake about it--Democrats and Republicans do not see the needs of the people of this nation through the same glasses. More Democrats in Congress will mean one thing in terms of the people's needs. Fewer Democrats, just as certainly, will mean another. What applies in Congress is also true on State and local levels.

As a Democrat, it is easy for me to urge voters to elect Democrats down the line. But I like to believe, and I do believe that Democrats are moved by something more than passion for their party. I like to believe, and I do believe that the Kennedy Administration, a Democratic Congress and the Democratic Party have something more to offer the people of the United States than a label.

We are Democrats because we have the will to try to see the world and the nation as it is. We are Democrats because we have the vision of a nation growing steadily in the strength, in the unity, in the equality and in the vigor of all its people in the years and decades to come. We are Democrats because we would not turn back the clock even if we could.

I recognize that it is not only Democrats who can be described in these terms. There are others. But I do say that there is a significant difference between a Republican Administration and a Democratic Administration in Washington. I do say that there is a difference in a Republican-controlled and a Democratic-controlled Congress and the number of votes in the majority counts. I saw measures--like hospital care for

October 1962

CAMPAIGN, 1962

Statement by Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana)

In a few days, the people of this state will be voting in the mid-term Congressional elections. They will be voting for state and local officials and for Congressmen. But let there be no doubt, these elections are also going to test public sentiment, not only in Montana but throughout the nation, on the Kennedy Administration. They are going to determine for the next two years, for the next six years whether this nation will move forward, stand still or slide backwards.

There are many questions at issue in this election. There is one question which has no place in this election. That is Cuba. Republicans, no less than Democrats, no less than independents have a vital stake in the outcome of that situation, a life or death stake. The President is the President of all of us--Democrats, Republicans and independents. He is not a political leader in that situation; he is the national leader.

There is no political profit or loss for anyone as far as Cuba is concerned. And there is no legitimate place for politics in it. There is only legitimate room for sober thought, restrained words and unity behind the President. Any other course would be an irresponsible gamble with the lives of just about every man, woman and child in the nation. That is not an exaggeration. It is a stark reality of life in the world of our times. Let no one make light of it.



older citizens--go by the board for want of a couple of votes in the Senate during the last Congress. And I saw Republicans gloat over this failure. The same is true--even more so--for the House of Representatives.

Any honest examination of the record of the eight years of the previous Administration and the two years of this Administration will reveal the difference between a strong Democratic representation in Congress and a Republican dominated government, as we had during the previous Republican Administration. I do say that the principal difference lies in seeing today as it is and tomorrow as it is likely to be, of looking ahead rather than behind, of discerning what we have gained instead of bewailing what we have not really lost. I do say that on a whole range of domestic questions the Kennedy Administration, with substantial Congressional support, has begun to move the nation off dead center. I do say that there has been a redoubled effort to strengthen our security. I do say we have made a beginning on meeting the accumulated social and economic needs of the people of the United States. For years, these needs--these public needs--had been neglected, ignored, hidden behind soap-opera smiles.

We are beginning to face them now. We will continue to face them, and we will act on them. The return to reality has begun. It is only a modest beginning which has been made but it is a genuine beginning. And if the people of this nation will it, there will be more to come, much more, in the next two--the next six years of leadership under John F. Kennedy. As citizens, even more than as Democrats, we have a responsibility

to invite all Americans, of whatever inclination to vote their confidence in this advance and to accelerate it in the November election.

You should know, the people of this state and of the nation should know, some of the facts about the advance under President Kennedy and how it contrasts with what went before. Let's start with unemployment. Nation-wide there are still several millions of Americans out of work. That has been the situation--a little better, a little worse--for many years. It happens to be a little better now, but in present circumstances, there is still inadequate assurance that it will not get worse again.

Now, Republicans, no less than Democrats, know that it is not good for a man to be out of work and without resources. It is not good for the man, his family or the nation. Where, then, is the difference? The difference is that this Administration believes that there is a public responsibility to act in that kind of a situation. It accepts that responsibility. The difference is that this Administration recognizes that no man will ever be really secure in his own work unless all men and women who are able and willing to work can find work. The difference is that this Administration does not hide its concern behind glowing statistics of progress which have no meaning for the man without a job or the man whose job doesn't pay enough for a minimum livelihood, or the man about to lose his job in the very process of progress. This Administration does not take refuge in the hope that vague, so-called natural economic forces will act to overcome these difficulties. It asks: what becomes of the man in the meantime? A question like that can only be answered by action.



This Administration and a Democratic Congress have acted. We have acted to extend unemployment compensation insurance. We have provided aid to the dependents of the unemployed. We have increased minimum wages.

Yet, this Administration also recognizes that these measures--the measures which so far have been adopted--are largely in the nature of a stop-gap. These measures relieve some of the adverse effects of unemployment, but they do not get at the heart of this demoralizing problem. And it is at the heart of the problem of unemployment which we are aiming. Democrats aspire to an America of challenge, of vigor, of growth. In that kind of America there will be more than enough work to go around. In that kind of America, men and women of all ages who want to work will never know the fear or the actuality of being out of work through no fault of their own. We have a long way to go. This problem is not going to be met overnight, in a month, in a year. But I can assure you of one thing: I know that the President, a Democratic Congress and the Democratic Party are not going to rest content until it is met.

A beginning has been made on this long-term problem with respect to the depressed areas. These are the festering sores on the economic face of the nation. We are beginning to see action on these focal points of stagnation, after years of neglect. And we will see more action.

We will see action, too, stemming from the Manpower Training Act. If the Democratic leadership of the nation is determined not to leave areas in permanent depression, we most certainly are not going to



leave men and women to vegetate in the backwash of rapidly changing patterns of industry, and in the increasing bypass of the unskilled or surplus skilled by the spread of automation. This Administration has begun to probe in depth, for the first time, the full implications of that word automation. The President has labeled it the foremost domestic challenge of our times and set the best brains he can find to work on it.

Automation is a challenge which is as full of promise in the long run as it is ominous in the short run. As Democrats, we are determined that the benefits of this great advance--and it is a great advance--will be spread throughout the population and not just to a few. We are determined that the sacrifices, the human price of this advance, and, there is a heavy human price--will be borne by all and not just by the man or woman who labors or who runs a small business for a livelihood.

There are other fields in which this Administration is trying and will continue to try to move the nation forward. In housing, we have acted, and we will continue to act to the end that decent shelter in city, town and country will be within the reach of all.

In the extension and improvement of the highways and airways a Democratic Administration and Congress have acted and will continue to act to meet today's urgencies and to anticipate the needs of tomorrow. In controlling the careless profiteering in drug manufacture and distribution we have acted and will continue to act to the end that thalidomide

tragedies will not be repeated. In developing the great natural resources of this country, in improving the supplies of water through pollution control, in power production, in setting aside large areas of our natural heritage of forest, river and coast for the recreation of the people, we have begun to act to meet the needs of today and tomorrow and will continue to act.

In connection with the West alone, here is what has been done in the last two years in some of these fields:

[Insert as needed items from the two memos attached.]

In encouraging small business and helping to improve its competitive position we have acted and will continue to act because we believe small business is the leaven which keeps the economy of the nation flexible and creative.

Insofar as big business and big labor are concerned, the actions of both have profound effect on the orderly growth of the nation's economy. This Administration has no quarrel with either. Nor will there be any quarrel, so long as both fulfill their responsibilities, not only to stockholders or members but, most important, to the nation as a whole. For it had better be clear once and for all that the President insists that no segment of this nation is greater than the whole--greater than the people

of the United States. The President is determined that public responsibilities shall be met. And I can tell you that the President is a very, very determined man when the interests of the entire nation are at stake.

Still ahead of us is the challenge to improve the educational structure of this nation from top to bottom. We will not rest content until every boy and girl has an opportunity to be schooled, in excellence, to the limites of their capacity and ambition, regardless of where they happen to be born and regardless of family financial conditions. This improvement is essential to the security and continued progress of the nation. It is basic to the achievement of all the ideals of equal opportunity and equal justice which are our common heritage.

Still with us is the struggle for decent hospitalization and related care for the older citizens of the nation. It is not that the other party does not recognize that people get old and get sick and frequently need expensive care which millions cannot afford. I do not know of anyone in public life who does not at least recognize that fact.

The difference is that this Administration, the Democratic Party and the enlightened Republicans who have joined with us are determined to what must be done to see to it that the older citizens get that care as a matter of right and not of charity, that they get it essentially as they now get old age social security. We are determined that they get it, not by chance, not by handout but with a dignity befitting Americans, as they now get social security retirement payments. The arguments against the



the President's program today are the same as those which were advanced in the thirties against social security and by much the same people and by the same grand old party.

Yet, who would change social security now? Who would stop the flow of those hard-earned monthly retirement checks? Who would want to force millions of older citizens to go back to the good old days before Social Security? I can tell you that this Administration has no intention of going back to those days. This Administration is determined to move further away from them. It is determined to extend social security retirement insurance to cover hospitalization and related care to all older Americans. You know, and I know and the people of this nation know that the present social security system works and has worked well for almost a quarter of a century. A system of hospitalization for older people, built, essentially, around the same social security approach can work just as well. That is what the President wants and that is what a strong Democratic Congress will try to deliver.

These, then, are some of the facts that the voters of this state and the nation are entitled to have. These are the domestic issues--the common sense issues--which we have begun to face as a nation. This is what peace is all about. As Democrats we seek peace, not to vegetate or to stagnate but to make the blessings of peace, the fruits of peace available to all Americans. That is what this campaign is all about. Republicans in general stand on one side of these basic human issues--the slow side,

the stalled side, the slip-back side. Democrats in general stand on the other. Without more Democrats in Congress--Democrats who believe in the kind of America the President believes in, the kind of America we believe in--a warm, vigorous, enlightened and dynamic America--we are not going to meet these issues.

And if we fail to meet these issues--these domestic, human issues--in a way which strengthens and unifies the nation, we will pay a heavy price at home in the years ahead. We will pay it, too, in the impact of this failure on the nation's place in the world, in foreign policy, regardless of the outcome of the present crisis in Cuba.

May I say that this Administration is not building from scratch in foreign policy. It is building on what has gone before because foreign policy does not stop when one administration ends and another begins. An administration inherits, in foreign policy, all the mistakes as well as all the achievements of the administrations which have preceded it, on Cuba as well as any other situation. Even if it is desirable, it is not easy to shift gears in foreign policy. It is not simple to bring about changes. It is not cheap.

When you worry about federal taxes--as you should--remember that well over half of the total budget goes for defense and related purposes. And when you worry about the growth of the federal government--as you should--remember that two out of every three of the almost four million federal employees are in the armed services or are civilians working for and with the armed services.

There is really only one way in which this costly federal expenditure of resources and energy can be significantly reduced. And that is by the creation of a more stable world situation, a more secure peace. That is what the President is working day and night to achieve. And I can assure you that if any man can lead in the modification of the present situation, if any man has the wit and wisdom to lead towards stability and peace, it is the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. He will need the support of an understanding Congress. He will need the patience and trust of all the American people, and if I know the people of this nation, he is going to get it.

A key element in this effort is a great enlargement in our international trade--in order that the resources of farm, mine and factory which we have in such abundance can be sold abroad in return for what we can use from abroad. The new trade law gives the President the power to act to this end. This law and this Administration will see to it, moreover, that a few people, a few industries are not going to bear the brunt of the adverse effects of this change which will be of benefit to the entire nation. This Administration will proceed carefully and with understanding and with special consideration for those who might experience temporary difficulties. The new law protects these people and industries. It also gives both industry and labor extensive help in adjusting to changes. But we have all got to face the fact that we can't sell more abroad if we are not ready to buy more



from abroad. We have all got to face the fact that a massive volume of international trade is now an integral part of our hope--in this state and throughout the world--for our own economic stability and advance in the years to come and for a stable peaceful world.

I have tried to give you a picture of what your Democratic Administration and Democratic Congress have been trying to do in Washington, and what still needs doing. We ask you to give us your help. We ask you to give us men and women in office in localities, in the state and in the Congress who will respond to the President's leadership in safeguarding our peace and for moving the nation forward for the benefit of all its citizens.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCENE

Address by Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana)

College of Great Falls, Great Falls, Montana

Monday, October 29, 1962, 8:15 P. M.

We are in the midst of the political campaign of 1962. Yet, it is not my intention to discuss this campaign, except incidentally. For, I am not here, tonight, as a Democrat which I am. Nor do I speak to you as a Senator in the Congress of the United States which by the grace of the people of this state I am. I am with you, rather, as one Montanan among other Montanans--Democrats, Republicans and Independents. And most of all I am here to speak with young Montanans as a former Professor of History and out of such knowledge as two decades of experience in the Congress may have given me.

It might be more dramatic, perhaps, if I were to discuss the issues of the impending election or, perhaps, the record of the 87th Congress. But the discussion would also be more transitory. No matter how important it may seem at the moment, the record of the 87th Congress is likely to be of interest primarily to historians a decade hence. And not long after November sixth, the passions of the current political campaign will cool. What seems urgent now will seem less so then. In time today's issues will become old issues. And, in time, new issues will emerge to excite future voters.

But regardless of this election or subsequent elections, Montana will still be here. So will the United States. And certain fundamental political matters--of which the work of the last Congress and the issues of the present campaign are but a fleeting reflection--will also be with us.

Now, does this mean that elections are unimportant? That the work of a Congress is trivial? It does not mean that at all. Every election is of great importance. Every Congress--for better or for worse--transacts public business which is also of great importance.

What I am trying to suggest is that elections and Congresses need to be seen in terms of the long history of American politics. In this deeper perspective, any single election, is not a be-all and end-all. Elections are, rather, the forks and the turns in a long journey. The decisions which the voters make at these critical points--at the turning points, at the forks--may prolong the journey. But whatever the decisions--the journey will go on.

What, then, is this long political journey on which we are embarked as a nation--this ultimate objective? It is one which began with the birth of the nation. It is the continuing effort to secure both the common good and equal opportunity for each individual American to do what he will with his life, consistent with the common good.

Basically that is what politics is all about, whether it be local, state or federal. If I confine my remarks to the federal scene, it is because, in our times, Washington has come to occupy the key position in the effort to insure the common good and the right of equal opportunity to every American.

It used to be that the federal government did not have a great deal to do with the basic political interests of Americans. In the frontier days, the average citizen was far more concerned in and far more affected by the



politics of his community or, at most, his state. Washington was a distant place in meaning to him as well as in miles. Indeed, all government was relatively unimportant to the shepherd or herdsman on the range. And once government had deeded his property it was of little importance to the early homesteader.

But times have changed. With education, with the improvements in communication and transportation, our individual needs and expectations have changed. Agriculture has changed. Industry and commerce have changed. And the rest of the world and its meaning for us as individuals have changed.

To independence which has been, from the outset, a major characteristic of American life has been added a great increase in the factor of a broad interdependence which has also been a characteristic of American life from the beginning. Those who went west in the early days were independent men and women, but they were also interdependent men and women in the sense, for example, that they traveled in wagon trains and formed communities for mutual protection, mutual aid and mutual comfort. The interdependence was not always one of choice. Rather it was one, largely, of necessity. And the growth of interdependence in our day is also not always one of choice but of necessity. The changes in our society and world have meant a change in the pattern of national government and politics. Community and State remain important to us in our lives as individuals, but the nation as a unit has grown in importance to us.

And it is hardly surprising. It was not necessary for anyone to plan or conspire to bring about this change. The federal government had to play a greater role, if we were to survive as a single free nation. Let me cite some comparatively recent examples of changing needs: How else--except through the federal government--would we have met the demands of the great

depression, with millions out of work and reduced to desperation in community after community, state after state? How else--except through the federal government--would we have met the demands of survival in World War II, with millions of people swept up into the armed services and transplanted to the far corners of the earth and millions of others funneled into industrial centers throughout the nation?

How, today, would we be able to find a safe-path for the nation--for the common good--in a world of vast change, except through the intensified use of the instrumentalities of the federal government? How, today, would we begin to deal with industrialization and automation which has spread industry across state borders, from coast to coast and has altered the pattern of livelihood for millions upon millions of people who work for a living? How would we deal with the technological revolution in agriculture which has deluged us with commodities while it has denuded the land of farmers and the farm families? How would we begin to move into the age of space-exploration, which involves the integrated use of science, industry and labor drawn from almost every state in the union?

We cannot escape these realities of our times. We have to face the fact that it is not possible for government and politics to remain fixed in the forms of the late 19th century or even the early 20th century, while all the rest of our society and the world evolves in the drastically altered patterns of the second half of the 20th century. In short, we must ask ourselves is it reasonable to expect stagecoach government while the rest of the nation moves over the threshold of the era of travel through space?

Believe me, I can appreciate a longing for simpler times, a nostalgia for a world that it is not more. In many ways, it was a gentler world and, perhaps, even a happier world. But the surest way to make the present



world less happy and less gentle, is to fail to face its realities, to fail to meet them as responsibly and as honestly as we can.

To a great extent, we are measuring up to these responsibilities. As the world and our nation have changed so, too, has our government. Even as we now have, for example, nationwide business, massive labor organization and big agriculture, we also have expanded government. Some may find this expansion either obnoxious or frightening. May I say that to the extent that growth in government on any level is not commensurate with the needs of our people it is to be deplored. But changes in government which arise from the realities of the times in which we live is as necessary as it is inevitable.

As government has changed so too have politics in America. There are millions more voters today than was the case a few decades ago. Part of this is population growth but part of it, too, comes from the fact that women vote whereas less than a half-century ago they did not. Racial and other groups who were excluded or excluded themselves in the past, more and more, exercise the suffrage. Millions of Americans, unfortunately, still do not vote--about 40 or 50 percent of the eligible voters. And, unfortunately, too, millions who vote in Presidential elections do not bother to vote in Congressional, local and state elections. Most of the voters in the nation now are in or near great cities, whereas a few decades ago most of them lived in rural America. TV and Radio have worked major transformations, particularly in national elections. All of these changes in voting patterns mean changes in the style of politics. And they mean changes in the immediate objectives of politics and political parties.

These objectives are often expressed in election slogans. And slogans change quickly. How many of us, for example, will know in which



election campaigns of the past the rallying cry was "Fifty-four Forty or Fight" or "Free Speech, Free Press, Free-Soil" or "Too Proud to Fight" or "Forty Acres and a Mule" or "Two Cars in Every Garage." Yet, at one time, these slogans electrified Americans from one end of the country to the other. Today, they are part of our history and few are aware of them. The slogans in this campaign have to do with "Castro" or "Socialism" or "Medicare" or something of the sort.

In short, the parties meet and clash on new issues as the old recede. Yet the issues, today, are not really new. They are reflections of the same basic political concerns of the American people which I mentioned earlier in my remarks as beginning with the beginning of the Republic. They are reflections of the same basic concerns which led to the older slogans which I just mentioned. We are still engaged in the old effort in a new setting to advance the common good and to insure the right of every American to equal opportunity.

The political conflicts which emerge today derive from the same basic premise of our national life that prevailed in Jefferson's day, Lincoln's or Roosevelt's: that governments exist to insure the common good and the right of all to equal opportunity. And politics exist as the instrumentality through which the people can seek to require governments to function for these purposes.

What has changed is not what the people seek through government and politics but the setting in which it is sought and the means by which it is sought. Let me try to illustrate the point by reference to some of the questions which are being discussed in the present campaign. Take, for example, the question of Cuba. Politics may still draw an issue in this situation as politics will, even though politics has little place in this delicate situation. But that Cuba is discussed at all in this campaign is because it bears a relationship to our common security and, therefore, to the common good. Hence, it is of national concern. Does this mean, however, that Cuba is the same question

as it was in McKinley's day or that the remedies of that simpler day are applicable today?

Consider for a moment that in McKinley's days we were spending \$190 million a year for all our defense. This year we are carrying a military budget of \$55 billion. In 1900, our armed forces were composed of a total of 125,000 men and the great bulk of these men were on duty in the United States. In 1961 we had a total of almost 2.5 million men and women in the armed services and 575,000 of them were on duty outside the United States on every continent of the world.

What these figures indicate is that the problem of safeguarding national security--the common good--has become vastly more complex and costly. It is now world-wide in scope. No matter what we may do about Cuba, the problem of safeguarding our security--our common good--is not going to dissolve. We still have a dangerous situation in the Far East and Southeast Asia. We still have the problem of working out far-reaching commercial and defense arrangements with Western Europe. We still have a largely unstable Latin America on our southern doorstep. We still have the problem of evolving satisfactory relations with the new nations of Africa, *And we still have Berlin.*

And over the whole still hangs the monumental problem of nuclear weapons and military rockets which are quite capable--and I do not exaggerate--of obliterating tens of millions of people in this state and nation or in Russia or in many other places in the world within the next couple of hours. How we handle the problem of Cuba will affect all of these other aspects of our security and, hence, the common good, and the President has to keep the whole in mind, not just a single situation which may emerge as a political issue in one campaign or another.



It might well be asked: "Well, what are we doing about all these challenges to the common good?" The answer is that a Democratic President, no less than his Republican predecessor is doing the best he can. The most important thing that any President can do is to try to keep his head and to keep the world-wide scene in perspective, and not be carried away by any single factor or situation in it, no matter how provocative and exasperating it may be. The next best thing he can do is to use whatever honorable means may be open to him, whether it be by diplomacy through the United Nations or whatever or by the judicious and careful use of our armed strength, to try to cool off some of these situations and reduce the tensions which are a constant threat not only to our peace but the world's peace, not only to our common good but to the common good of the human race. And the best thing that the rest of us can do to help him and thereby help ourselves is to avoid losing our tempers over one situation and to try to understand the whole of what the President--any President--is confronted with in foreign policy and to weigh our words carefully in discussing it. We need to think through the total situation with as little heat and as much light as possible--the immediate demands of the political scene notwithstanding.

Let me turn next to a domestic question of the current campaign. It, too, will illustrate that what is new on the political scene is really not new at all. Rather it is a new reflection in new circumstances of the basic political struggle which is as old as the Republic, the struggle to insure the common good and the right of equal opportunity for all Americans. I refer to the so-called issues of "medicare." The term "medicare" is as



imprecise as is "socialized medicine." These are slogans which may have a place in an election campaign but which tell very little about what is really at issue. What is actually involved is the question of whether or not the Social Security system of old age insurance which has operated for a quarter of a century should be extended to cover a part of the cost of hospital care for all persons over 65 years of age.

A program of this kind will cost money because hospital care costs money. But it will also be a great assist to millions of older citizens and to their children because it provides a dignified way for meeting the major threat which prolonged hospital care at today's high costs frequently poses to the financial stability of the average American family.

Now this is not an idea someone suddenly dreamed up to win a few votes in a political campaign. It has been discussed for many years. In fact, the federal government has been subsidizing hospital building in the states for years, without many complaints, to try to reduce the end cost of hospital care and to keep up with growing needs. But the federal government has not had much to do directly with the costs of care of patients. We might note, however, that some form of prepaid universal hospital insurance against costly illness on a national basis is a characteristic of just about every civilized nation in the world. Indeed, our northern neighbor Canada has had a national hospital plan for years which provides not merely for those over 65 years of age and for a few months, but insures a hospital bed or nursing care for every Canadian of every age and for as long as it is needed. In view of the stories about the Saskatchewan doctors a few months ago, we might bear the other side of the Canadian coin equally in mind.

The truth is that we have never regarded it as desirable to permit older citizens to waste away, as some primitive tribes in the polar regions were reported once to have done. We do not regard that course as one in keeping with the common good or as consistent with the right of every American to equal opportunity, let alone as in harmony with our general religious beliefs.

Moreover, for a long time, we have not regarded this problem of adequate care as one exclusively of family responsibility. Private charity, localities and states for many decades have supplemented individual or family capacities to meet hospital bills. The extent of this public supplement has long been a part of local and state politics. In some instances--as for example--in mental illness or in tuberculosis<sup>ss</sup> a total public obligation is assumed in many states.

The issue of the public financial supplement arises now on the national scene, not because someone conspired to make it an issue but because circumstances have changed. The fact is that more and more people are living longer and the life-span is constantly being extended. In consequence the need for hospital care is constantly increasing particularly among old people, even as the cost of hospital care rises constantly. At the same time, families are tending to fragment and to scatter throughout the nation on a far more extensive scale than in the past and the young are less able to provide for the older members of the unit and still meet their own family responsibilities. Finally, charities, communities and states are more and more unable to meet the expanded need for a public supplement to meet hospital costs.



These are the realities of our times. They have got to be faced and faced soon. They have got to be faced just as the issue of federal old age social security was faced in the thirties and is now no longer a major issue in the political arena.

It is out of these current realities that there has arisen a new political issue which some call "medicare" and some "socialized medicine" but which is neither. It is, rather, an effort to come to grips in a practical way with a very old political concern, the concern for the common good and the right of Americans to equal opportunity.

It would be possible to cite other examples of campaign issues which arise, each a reflection of the basic and continuing political drives of our national life. The issues appear and disappear and appear in new form, but the drive remains constant.

For it is the continuing search for the common good and the continuing effort to realize in practice the concept of equal opportunity that give vitality to the American system of human freedom. If we would insure that vitality, we will pay not less attention to politics but more. We will recognize that state and local politics, are of great significance, along with federal politics and we will participate vigorously in them. We will see that each election while it is not a be-all and an end-all in our national life is nevertheless a significant milestone in the same quest which led to the creation of the Republic. And we will see finally that it is our obligation to ourselves and to the nation to make the most of each election in terms of that quest.